

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Executive Summary:

The Secretary of Education and the Deputy Secretary for the Agency of Education (AOE) provide direction to the Student Support Services Division which is composed of Special Education, MTSS and Early Learning teams. These teams work in collaboration to provide technical assistance and support for building capacity at the LEA level in order to meet state and federal requirements for special education, assessment, and other direct support services for students PK-12 in Vermont schools. In order to provide a more unified approach to technical assistance, monitoring and professional learning opportunities, the AOE has developed cross-team collaboratives. This cross-team approach began in FFY2016 as part of a continuous improvement process at the AOE to ensure alignment of initiatives and consistent messaging to LEAs throughout Vermont. The special education team is an active part of the cross-teams that review data related to Vermont's ESSA State Plan as well as spearheading technical assistance and supports related to IDEA B requirements.

Vermont's Act 46 was passed by the legislature in FFY2015 with its stated goal to improve education outcomes and equity by creating larger and more efficient school governance structures. The final LEA consolidations resulting from Act 46 became effective in FFY2017. Vermont's Act 173 was passed during the FFY2017 year and requires a major shift in education funding from a reimbursement model to a census based model. Although its impact is not yet known, the influence on IDEA B program work will be substantial and is why many educational systems in Vermont are currently being reviewed and why data may look different from previous APR reporting by the AOE.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

57

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The special education team at the AOE works closely with the data team and the fiscal team to ensure that there are systems in place for meeting the IDEA Part B requirements. This includes the current general supervision systems related to:

Compliance Monitoring: The special education monitoring team reviews eight (8) to ten (10) LEAs for special education compliance each year. Compliance monitoring is conducted through document reviews, telephone interviews, and when appropriate on-site visits. Based on the results of data, technical assistance is provided immediately and when necessary the AOE will issue corrective action plans when it identifies areas of non-compliance. Once a corrective action plan has been issued, the LEA has one year to correct individual incidents of non-compliance as well as any systemic issues identified by the AOE. The AOE monitoring team provides follow-up technical assistance and support to ensure that any corrective action measures are rectified within the timeframe identified in state and federal special education regulations.

Dispute Resolution: The Agency of Education maintains multiple dispute resolution options for its constituents including mediation, administrative complaints, due process, and when warranted licensure investigations. The AOE is solely responsible for all costs associated with mediation. The AOE ensures that mediation is voluntary on the part of both parties, is not used to deny or delay a parent's right to a due process hearing, and is conducted by a qualified and impartial mediator. Mediation sessions are held in a timely manner and in a mutually convenient location. Binding agreements are created by the parties following successful mediation. Sessions are confidential and not used in subsequent due process hearings. Administrative complaints are handled by the AOE legal department with input from all parties involved. Licensed attorneys serve as impartial hearing officers and are also supplied through the AOE at no cost to either party. Licensure complaints are handled through the Educator Quality Division investigator who conducts a full licensure review. Based upon this review, investigation outcomes range from no findings to full revocation of an educator license.

Results Based Monitoring System: As discussed in the FFY2016 APR report, the AOE began to work with the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) to review its current compliance based monitoring system and look for opportunities to include more results based accountability elements for improved student outcomes. Full implementation of that work was delayed due to new state regulations and staffing capacity. The AOE will be reporting more fully on this work in the FFY2018 APR.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The special education team offers a variety of technical assistance options to LEAs and families. Examples of universal support and technical assistance provided includes regular and open communication between the special education program and monitoring staff with LEA administrators, teachers and parents through:

- the team's dedicated technical assistance phone line and email which are available 24/7 with a goal of 1-2 business day response time;
- attendance by staff at regular in-person meetings with school professionals and leadership teams;
- parent referrals to Vermont's parent information center, Vermont Family Network (VFN); and
- provision of professional development in early intervention and educational services through collaboration with the early learning team

When needed, the AOE also provides more targeted support and technical assistance through workshops, webinars and direct assistance in specific areas such as:

- IEP development
- post-secondary transition planning and support
- co-teaching
- data literacy
- implementation and improvement science strategies

In addition to technical assistance provided to the field, the AOE partakes of support from national technical assistance centers to ensure that its staff is providing timely, relevant, and accurate support to the field for improved student outcomes. Minimally the AOE has availed itself of technical assistance, professional learning and support from the following:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- General Support from NCSI, NTACTION, and SWIFT;
- Financial Support from CIFR
- Data support from IDC and CIID
- Dispute Resolution support from CADRE;
- Early Learning/ECSE Support from ECTA, DASY, and NCPMI (Nat'l Ctr for Pyramid Model Innovations); and
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)

One particular effort regarding coordinated TA support involved the Early Education team and the Part B Data Manager working with DASY and ECTA for most of the 2018 calendar year to troubleshoot the decreasing number of students making it through the analysis tools associated with Indicator 7 (Early Childhood Outcomes).

Together a project plan was developed to work with the LEA-level data steward to follow data through the data system and process to identify any technical errors. This review provides guidance through edits and developments applicable to next year's data collection tool.

For this year's data collection the AOE was able to clarify to districts what data they should be sending to VT AOE using a clear and concise explanation. There was also an alignment of communications efforts so the material that the LEA Early Education data stewards received was shared with all LEA data stewards in the data communication cycle. These combined efforts increased our responsiveness from 95 students to 516 this year.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

In order to provide a more unified approach to technical assistance and professional learning opportunities, the AOE developed cross-team collaboratives beginning in FFY2016. This internal structure allows for better alignment and greater flexibility of professional learning and braided funding opportunities. AOE teams work together to develop a network of consultants with expertise in providing support to schools in implementing evidence-based practices, school-wide improvement models, and prevention models to improve instruction and learning for every student in Vermont. Examples include but are not limited to:

- On-site group and individual professional learning in both general and specialized areas such as finance and transition is provided by team members and contracted staff. Webinars, telephone conferences, training sessions and desk audits are also provided. When required, or appropriate, one-on-one professional learning is offered for school administrators and staff.
- **Professional Learning Network (PLN)** The Vermont Professional Learning Network works specifically on Instructional Leadership and Common Core implementation. It is state-wide with face-to-face programs in multiple sites, as well as virtual learning opportunities using Multiple Means of Communication such as online events and courses, webinars, blog with comments, and updates on Google+, Facebook and Twitter, accessible to all professionals at all levels in the State of Vermont.
- **OTHER PROFESSIONAL LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:** AOE teams partner and participate in various trainings and professional learning opportunities offered by statewide stakeholder groups and contracted vendors.

In addition, if the AOE contracts with an external provider for professional learning services, there are pre/post self-assessments requested of participants to ensure that the professional learning opportunities are a cost-effective use of AOE resources.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2016 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2016 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2016 APR in 2018, is available.

Final copies of the FFY2017 APR will be distributed to members of the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council, the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators, Vermont Part C staff, the Vermont Family Network and others who have been involved in the development process. Information about the APR will be made available to the media by the Vermont Agency of Education Communications Director. The APR will be made available to the public via the Vermont Agency of Education website: <https://education.vermont.gov/data-and-reporting/school-reports/special-education-reports> under the section titled data and reporting - Annual Performance Reports.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Three of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 1, 2019. The State provided the required information.

Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 1: Graduation

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			80.00%	80.00%		72.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%
Data		78.48%	78.20%	80.62%	66.16%	68.85%	78.93%	79.07%	81.31%	79.63%	70.26%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	86.00%	86.00%
Data	79.85%	80.77%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	86.00%	86.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 1: Graduation

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	737	837
SY 2016-17 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	9/28/2018	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	964	1,019
SY 2016-17 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	9/28/2018	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	76.45%	Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

Vermont reviews 4, 5 and 6 year graduation rate cohorts and reports the highest of the three. The 6 year graduation rates are most often the highest, but to make sure that the AOE understands growth or slippage towards the target all three years are analyzed.

The counts overwritten above are for the cohort with the highest graduation rate, the 6 year graduation cohort. The table below shows information for the cohorts which ended (or graduated) in the 2016-2017 school year.

Graduation Cohort	Graduate Count	Adjusted Cohort Count	Graduation Rate
4 Year	737	964	76.45%
5 Year	794	1017	78.07%
6 Year	837	1019	82.14%

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
837	1,019	80.77%	86.00%	82.14%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: Extended ACGR

Provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

The AOE provides guidance to LEAs in developing local graduation requirements. The information below is extracted from Section 2120.7 of Vermont's Education Quality Standards regarding Graduation Requirements:

A student meets the requirements for graduation when the student demonstrates evidence of proficiency in the curriculum outlined in 2120.5, and completion of any other requirements specified by the local board of the school attended by the student.

For students eligible for special education services under IDEA or protected by Section 504 of the federal Rehabilitation Act, the student shall meet the same graduation requirements as nondisabled peers in an accommodated and/or modified manner. These modifications will be documented in each student's Personalized Learning Plan and/or IEP.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 1: Graduation

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
 Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			4.00%	3.50%		3.25%	3.25%	3.25%	3.25%	3.25%	3.25%
Data		3.61%	3.82%	3.71%	3.90%	3.61%	3.15%	3.06%	3.47%	4.19%	3.36%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	3.25%	3.25%
Data	3.45%	1.81%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	3.25%	3.20%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:
Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
 Option 2

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2 when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? **No**

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	588	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	1	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	15	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	188	null
SY 2016-17 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	5/31/2018	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	4	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total Number of all youth with IEPs who were in high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
188	4,506	1.81%	3.25%	4.17%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology

- Change numerator description in data table
 Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Vermont calculates dropout rate by dividing the number of youth with IEPs (ages 6-21) who exited special education due to dropping out by the total number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who were reported in December 1 Child Count.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

Vermont defines a drop out as follows:

Students who were enrolled at the start of the reporting period, were not enrolled at the end of the reporting period, and did not exit special education through any of the other exit reasons. This includes dropouts, runaways, expulsions, status unknown, and students who moved and are not known to be continuing in another educational program. Students with 10 consecutive days of unexcused absences are included in the report as dropouts.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? **No**

Reasons for Slippage

Due to Vermont's Act 46 requirement, there has been considerable consolidation activity at the LEA level and this could be affecting how LEAs are reporting students exits. The AOE has added clarification to its instructions for collection of the Exiting data to address the correct exit codes to use and when to not use them. The AOE plans to share further clarification and use case examples to the LEA's for next year's Exiting collection if necessary. Once that data is available, further clarifications that affect the Exiting counts will be issued to help LEAs increase understanding of those clarifications.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2017 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Overall	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.50%			99.00%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%
			Data		98.33%	96.59%	96.37%	98.80%	97.70%	98.20%	97.46%	97.98%	98.26%	95.25%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			96.70%			99.00%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%
			Data		98.42%	96.80%	96.23%	98.73%	97.00%	97.70%	96.04%	97.90%	97.83%	94.40%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	99.25%	99.25%
		Data	96.07%	95.87%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	99.25%	99.25%
		Data	96.22%	95.73%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	99.25%	99.25%
Math	A ≥ Overall	99.25%	99.25%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
FFY 2017 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? no

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Math assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	0	0	95.87%	99.25%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	0	0	95.73%	99.25%		N/A	N/A

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

In the attachment for this indicator there are links and screenshots to guide you through the public reporting aspect of the data associated with the assessment results. These reports render best with Internet Explorer.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

VT is currently in initial implementation of its SLDS. This change has been more challenging for some districts than it has been for others and many are late in making their required data submissions to the SEA. As such, the data required for this indicator were not ready for the December EdFacts due date. VT AOE staff are working intensively with the few remaining schools and districts to help them successfully submit their remaining data for the 2017-2018 school year. VT AOE hopes the data to create the EdFacts files will be ready to post by **Early Summer 2019**.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2018 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2016, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2017.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 OSEP response

In the attachment for this indicator there are links and screenshots to guide you through the public reporting aspect of the data associated with the assessment results. These reports render best with Internet Explorer.

OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Because the State provided no data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

Required Actions

The State did not provide data for FFY 2017. The State must provide the required data for FFY 2018 in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR.

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2019 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2017, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2018.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Reporting Group Selection

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Based on previously reported data on the Historical Data and Targets page these are the grade groups that will be provided on the FFY 2017 Data pages.

Group	Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS	Other
A	Overall	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	

If you need to change your grade groups, please contact your State Contact, who will discuss the changes you wish to make and help you coordinate with the GRADS team to make your changes.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			27.00%			27.00%	27.00%	28.00%	28.00%	28.00%	12.13%
			Data		17.81%	21.41%	18.58%	25.65%	26.62%	21.91%	24.70%	23.83%	22.97%	12.13%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			20.00%			24.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	7.21%
			Data		19.10%	21.80%	14.89%	22.39%	22.60%	17.46%	18.37%	17.68%	17.14%	7.21%

	Group Name	FFY	2015	2016
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	12.13%	12.15%
		Data	14.16%	13.31%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	7.21%	7.25%
		Data	9.25%	8.51%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	12.20%	12.25%
Math	A ≥ Overall	7.30%	7.35%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
FFY 2017 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2017 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? no

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Data Source: SY 2017-18 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 3/28/2019

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	0	0	13.31%	12.20%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A Overall	0	0	8.51%	7.30%		N/A	N/A

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

In the attachment for this indicator there are links and screenshots to guide you through the public reporting aspect of the data associated with the assessment results. These reports render best with Internet Explorer.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

VT is currently in initial implementation of its SLDS. This change has been more challenging for some districts than it has been for others and many are late in making their required data submissions to the SEA. As such, the data required for this indicator were not ready for the December EdFacts due date. VT AOE staff are working intensively with the few remaining schools and districts to help them successfully submit their remaining data for the 2017-2018 school year. VT AOE hopes the data to create the EdFacts files will be ready to post by **Early Summer 2019**.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2018 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2016, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2017.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 OSEP response

In the attachment for this indicator there are links and screenshots to guide you through the public reporting aspect of the data associated with the assessment results. These reports render best with Internet Explorer.

OSEP Response

The State did not provide any data for this indicator. Because the State provided no data for this indicator, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Required Actions

The State did not provide data for FFY 2017. The State must provide the required data for FFY 2018 in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.67%	1.67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≤	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
0	58	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

A significant discrepancy for any individual LEA is defined as an LEA that has a rate of suspension/expulsions greater than ten days that is more than 3 percent of that LEAs total special education population. The suspension/expulsion rate is derived from the total number of suspension/expulsions >10 days for special education students in an LEA (numerator) divided by the total number of special education students in the LEA (denominator).

The Special Education team used a document the IDEA Data Center published called "[Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide](#)" to analyze the comparison of this data.

The source information for the numerator in the LEA calculations was the same as that used to populate the "Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal: School Year 2016-2017" (Table 5, in Section A, Column 3B), submitted to OSEP in November 2017. The source information for the denominator in the LEA calculations was the same as that used to populate the "Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of IDEA, as Amended" (Table 1) submitted to OSEP in July 2017. Additional information on these reports may be found at [ideadata.org](#).

During the 2016 - 2017 school year, only 12 of Vermont's then 58 LEAs reported any occurrences of suspensions or expulsions greater than 10 days. Of these LEAs that reported suspensions or expulsions exceeding 10 days, the rate of suspension/expulsion averaged less than 1.3%. No LEAs were excluded due to minimum "n" size in this calculation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Any findings of significant discrepancy will generate an analysis of policies, procedures, and practices by the Special Education State Monitoring team and notification to the LEA. LEAs are also required to conduct this review as well (consistent with CFR § 300.170(b)). If appropriate, the LEAs will revise policies, practices, and procedures relating to each of the following topics:

- Development and implementation of IEPs
- The use of Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports
- Procedural safeguards to comply with the requirements of the IDEA

The reporting of any findings of noncompliance and the corrections must be consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	58	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Vermont identifies LEAs with significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions, by race or ethnicity, through the following steps:

- Separately, for each race and ethnicity category, aggregate each LEA's total number of IEP students who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, and divide by the total number of IEP students of that race or ethnicity in the LEA. This process produces the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions by race and ethnicity for each LEA.
- Separately, for each race and ethnicity category, identify LEAs which have a long-term suspension rate of greater than 3%. LEAs which had fewer than 4 long-term suspensions and expulsions in a given race or ethnicity category are excluded.

The Special Education team used a document the IDEA Data Center published called "[Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide](#)" to analyze the comparison of this data.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
FFY 2016 Identification of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2017 using 2016-2017 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Consistent with CFR § 300.170(b), any findings of significant discrepancy will generate an analysis of policies, procedures, and practices by the AOE with notification to the LEA. In addition, LEAs are also required to conduct their own review and if appropriate, LEAs will their revise policies, practices, and procedures relating to each of the following topics:

- Development and implementation of IEPs
- The use of Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports
- Procedural safeguards to comply with the requirements of the IDEA

The reporting of any findings of noncompliance and the corrections for this indicator must be consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			78.00%	78.50%	78.50%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%
		Data		77.89%	71.15%	69.95%	69.82%	72.21%	74.01%	73.71%	73.78%	74.15%	74.93%
B	2005	Target ≤			8.00%	7.50%	7.50%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%
		Data		8.59%	10.14%	9.47%	8.90%	8.14%	7.14%	6.90%	7.12%	6.61%	6.29%
C	2005	Target ≤			4.04%	4.00%	4.00%	3.85%	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%
		Data		5.81%	6.35%	6.48%	6.88%	6.28%	6.14%	5.95%	5.65%	6.24%	5.77%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	79.00%	79.00%
	Data	75.76%	76.77%
B	Target ≤	7.00%	7.00%
	Data	5.72%	5.15%
C	Target ≤	3.75%	3.75%
	Data	5.94%	6.05%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	79.00%	79.00%
Target B ≤	7.00%	7.00%
Target C ≤	3.75%	3.75%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	12,780	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,946	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	589	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	618	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	139	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/12/2018	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	13	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,946	12,780	76.77%	79.00%	77.82%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	589	12,780	5.15%	7.00%	4.61%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	770	12,780	6.05%	3.75%	6.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Educational Environments (children 6-21)
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									71.78%	71.78%	71.78%
		Data									71.58%	73.68%	76.17%
B	2011	Target ≤									6.19%	6.19%	6.19%
		Data									6.39%	4.81%	2.19%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	71.78%	71.78%
	Data	76.44%	75.81%
B	Target ≤	6.19%	6.19%
	Data	1.80%	1.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	71.78%	71.78%
Target B ≤	6.19%	6.19%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	2,005	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,516	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	3	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b2. Number of children attending separate school	10	null
SY 2017-18 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/12/2018	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,516	2,005	75.81%	71.78%	75.61%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	14	2,005	1.00%	6.19%	0.70%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2014	Target ≥						92.88%	92.88%	92.88%	92.88%	92.88%	86.63%
		Data					92.38%	89.91%	89.90%	91.14%	87.52%	89.13%	86.63%
A2	2014	Target ≥						53.34%	53.34%	53.34%	53.34%	53.34%	40.91%
		Data					52.84%	48.75%	52.30%	48.50%	48.80%	68.00%	40.91%
B1	2014	Target ≥						91.21%	91.21%	91.21%	91.21%	91.21%	87.30%
		Data					90.71%	89.32%	91.10%	92.69%	86.16%	90.68%	87.30%
B2	2014	Target ≥						50.03%	50.30%	50.03%	50.03%	50.03%	32.49%
		Data					49.53%	46.36%	49.80%	48.20%	39.60%	56.00%	32.49%
C1	2014	Target ≥						93.27%	93.27%	93.27%	93.27%	93.27%	86.00%
		Data					92.77%	91.30%	92.20%	90.55%	87.83%	91.46%	86.00%
C2	2014	Target ≥						61.23%	61.23%	61.23%	61.23%	61.23%	54.71%
		Data					60.73%	58.31%	62.50%	59.43%	56.75%	64.00%	54.71%

	FFY	2015	2016
A1	Target ≥	86.63%	86.63%
	Data	85.17%	76.67%
A2	Target ≥	40.91%	40.91%
	Data	51.06%	68.75%
B1	Target ≥	87.30%	87.30%
	Data	84.44%	80.65%
B2	Target ≥	32.49%	32.49%
	Data	39.44%	58.33%
C1	Target ≥	86.00%	86.00%
	Data	79.27%	75.00%
C2	Target ≥	54.71%	54.71%
	Data	61.27%	76.04%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	86.63%	87.13%
Target A2 ≥	40.91%	41.41%
Target B1 ≥	87.30%	87.80%
Target B2 ≥	32.49%	32.99%
Target C1 ≥	86.00%	86.50%
Target C2 ≥	54.71%	55.21%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	516
--	-----

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	69	13.37%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	196	37.98%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	113	21.90%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	138	26.74%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	309.00	378.00	76.67%	86.63%	81.75%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	251.00	516.00	68.75%	40.91%	48.64%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	74	14.34%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	256	49.61%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	152	29.46%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	34	6.59%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	408.00	482.00	80.65%	87.30%	84.65%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	186.00	516.00	58.33%	32.49%	36.05%	Met Target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	54	10.49%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	166	32.23%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	145	28.16%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	150	29.13%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2016	FFY 2017	FFY 2017	Status	Slippage
6/24/2019							

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

			Data	Target	Data		
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	311.00	365.00	75.00%	86.00%	85.21%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	295.00	515.00	76.04%	54.71%	57.28%	Met Target	No Slippage

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) entry, exit and progress data is determined and collected by school district IEP teams through the IEP process. In 2013, AOE began to implement the use of the integrated ECO IEP.

Instruments used to gather ECO entry, exit and progress data is a local IEP decision, however Teaching Strategies Gold is the state approved universal PreK progress monitoring assessment that is required two times per year. ECO data is collected via Child Count data collection two times per year.

[VT's ECO Practice and Procedures Manual](#) [link] provides guidance for IEP teams to make determinations and reporting.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			30.12%	32.12%	34.12%	36.12%	38.12%	38.12%	38.12%	38.12%	38.12%
Data		28.00%	34.02%	34.13%	36.18%	34.56%	37.04%	31.88%	37.09%	35.73%	37.04%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	38.12%	38.12%
Data	36.08%	36.75%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	38.12%	38.12%

Key:  Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
337	910	36.75%	38.12%	37.03%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	6.76%	13465.00
---	-------	----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The data starts out as a full PK-12 dataset for Vermont's research partner to start working from. Analysis of the survey data utilizing Rasch modeling was completed with Winsteps v.3.74 software. The statistical summary of the 2018 analysis is pasted below. The two surveys, one for parents of preschool students and one for parents of students in Kindergarten through Grade 12, were combined for the purpose of the Rasch analysis. The questions are aligned and calibrated across age groups and, are monitored by Vermont AOE.

PART B Preschool Special Education

Percent at or above: 600/550 53%/63% (SE of the mean = 2.5%)
 Number of Valid Responses: 129 Measurement reliability: 0.89-0.94
 Mean Measure: 619 Measurement SD 156

PART B Grades K - 12

Percent at or above: 600/550 34%/45% (SE of the mean = 1.1%)
 Number of Valid Responses: 776 Measurement reliability: 0.91-0.94
 Mean Measure: 557 Measurement SD 152

PART B ALL

Percent at or above: 600/550 37%/48% (SE of the mean = 0.3%)
 Number of Valid Responses: 905 Measurement reliability: 0.91-0.94
 Mean Measure: 565 Measurement SD 154

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

To determine if the parents responding to this survey were representative of the parents for all children receiving special education services, race/ethnicity, disability, gender, and age demographics, the children whose parents responded to the survey were compared with the same demographics for all children whose parents were mailed a survey. Below is a table of counts and percentages for the four demographic groups.

The table below shows a comparison of population and respondent characteristics. The largest difference between population and respondents is 4.51%. As you can see below race/ethnicity, most disabilities, and gender are very representative with differences of less than 3%. Our biggest difference is in the age group 3 to 5 at 4.51%, which is likely causing the 3.37% difference with developmental delay. Vermont AOE's plans to clarify the usage of the contact information from this data and engage with respondents regarding results in order to encourage a better response from all groups especially the 3 to 5 age group.

Demographic Characteristic	Count of Respondent Children	Percent of Respondent Children	Count of Eligible Children	Percent of Eligible Children	Over/Under Representation*
----------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Race/Ethnicity

Non-White**	76	8.40%	1096	8.14%	0.26%
White	829	91.60%	12369	91.86%	-0.26%
Totals	905	100.00%	13465	100.00%	0.00%

Disability

Autism Spectrum Disorder	67	7.40%	1020	7.58%	-0.17%
Developmental Delay	209	23.09%	2656	19.73%	3.37%
Emotional Disturbance	108	11.93%	1992	14.79%	-2.86%
Intellectual Disability	38	4.20%	584	4.34%	-0.14%
Multiple Disabilities	20	2.21%	209	1.55%	0.66%
Other Health Impairment	150	16.57%	2296	17.05%	-0.48%
Specific Learning Disability	244	26.96%	3605	26.77%	0.19%
Speech or Language Impairment	56	6.19%	952	7.07%	-0.88%
All Other Disabilities***	13	1.44%	151	1.12%	0.32%
Totals	905	100.00%	13465	100.00%	0.00%

Gender

Female	307	33.92%	4632	34.40%	-0.48%
Male	598	66.08%	8833	65.60%	0.48%
Totals	905	100.00%	13465	100.00%	0.00%

Age

3 to 5	163	18.01%	1818	13.50%	4.51%
6 to 11	345	38.12%	5442	40.42%	-2.29%
12 to 17	368	40.66%	5694	42.29%	-1.62%
18 to 21	29	3.20%	511	3.80%	-0.59%
Totals	905	100.00%	13465	100.00%	0.00%

*Over/Under Representation is the percent of respondent children minus the percent of eligible population.

**Non-White includes Hispanic, African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander and multiracial.

***All Other Disabilities Includes: Deaf, Deaf-Blindness, Hard of Hearing & Hearing Loss, Orthopedic Impairment, Traumatic Brain Injury and Visual Impairment.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
10	0	57	0%	0%	0%

Status
Met Target

Slippage
No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Disproportionate Representation is a measurement of whether the population of IEP students in LEAs is statistically different than that of the total student population in terms of race or ethnicity. The analysis is done by comparing the proportion of each race or ethnicity in the IEP population with the same group on the total student population, using techniques which prevent false identification due to small counts. The analysis is conducted two ways. In the first, the total populations are compared. In the second, a similar comparison is done for each disability category.

Here is Vermont’s current state analysis associated with Disproportionate Representation:

- The calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.):
 - VT uses risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and alternate risk ratio
 - VT analyzes children with disabilities in total and the following 6 impairments
 - Autism;
 - Intellectual disabilities;
 - Specific learning disabilities;
 - Emotional disturbance;
 - Speech or language impairments;
 - Other health impairments;
 - Any minimum cell or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator):
 - Vermont uses these for rich ratio analysis is used, not to exclude districts
 - VT’s minimum cell sized 3 and minimum N-sizes 10
 - The number of years of data used in the calculation:
 - VT’s current state is 1 year of data
 - The threshold at disproportionate representation is identified:
 - VT has a 3 point criterion that works in combination to identify LEAs with significant disproportionality

A particular challenge for Vermont in defining disproportionate representation is the largely homogeneous nature of Vermont’s student population. In both regular education and special education settings, at least 95 percent of the total student population has historically been reported as white. In addition, the counts of children receiving special education in each LEA are relatively small, averaging just over 200 students per LEA. Taken together, the homogeneity of the student population and relatively small child counts result in a situation where the addition of just one child into special education can create a large difference in the race/ethnicity composition of children receiving IDEA-B services in an LEA. To address these challenges, Vermont created three criteria designed to provide a meaningful, valid and reliable methodology for identifying LEAs with disproportionate representation.

Criterion 1:

LEA-level Weighted Risk Ratio > 3.0 or LEA-level Alternate Risk Ratio >3.0 or <.33 if the sum of the comparison group (all other race/ethnicity categories) used to calculate the Weighted Risk Ratio is <11.

- The LEA-level risk of a particular racial/ethnic group of students receiving special education services for a specific disability; and
- The risk for all other students in the LEA of receiving special education services for a specific disability weighted for the racial/ethnic composition of the state.
- When a weighted risk ratio is not appropriate because there are fewer than 11 students in the comparison group, Alternate Risk Ratios was first used in Vermont as an appropriate alternative beginning in FFY 2006. The Alternate Risk Ratio is not weighted for the racial/ethnic composition of the state.

Criterion 2:

Greater than 10 students receiving special education services for a specific disability in the special education race/ethnicity category in the LEA of analysis when examining overrepresentation or, beginning in FFY 2006, an “expected count” of >10 students in the special education race/ethnicity category if examining underrepresentation.

Risk ratios can be substantively impacted by the addition of as little as one student in a race/ethnicity category containing fewer than 11 students and become unreliable in identifying disproportionate representation. Furthermore, the Vermont Agency of Education (VT AOE) “small ‘n’ rule” prohibits public reporting of potentially personally identifying information where the number of students being reported on is less than or equal to 10. For these reasons, any single cell used for risk ratio analysis must contain at least **eleven** students when examining overrepresentation or an “expected count” of at least **eleven** students when examining underrepresentation.

Criterion 3

The difference between the actual count of special education students with a specific disability in a race/ethnicity category and the expected count of special education students with a specific disability in the race/ethnicity category is >10 when examining either overrepresentation or underrepresentation using Weighted or Alternate Risk Ratios.

This criterion prevents spurious identification of an LEA for having disproportionate representation when a combination of “small ‘n’” sizes across race/ethnicity categories causes both the Weighted Risk Ratio and Alternate Risk Ratio to be unreliable. As noted above and in the Westat technical assistance documentation, when working with small numbers of students, the addition or subtraction of even one student in a particular race/ethnicity category can cause dramatic fluctuations in risk ratios, making them very difficult to interpret meaningfully. This criterion, in combination with the other two, provides a meaningful, valid and reliable methodology for identifying LEAs with disproportionate representation.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

To determine whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education was the result of inappropriate identification, the following activities, based on policies of the State of Vermont Agency of Education Special Education Monitoring Team (AOE), were completed:

Activities:

9.1 Letters from the special education monitoring team were sent to the ten (10) LEAs alerting them that their submitted Child Count data indicated suspected disproportionate overrepresentation within their special education population.

9.2 Copies of evaluations of those students impacted by the suspected disproportionate representation as well as any information regarding LEA policies, procedures and practices were requested from the LEAs and reviewed by the AOE.

9.2.1 Review of LEA Student Files: A sampling of files from students potentially impacted by this indicator were reviewed by the AOE in order to verify if inappropriate identification was occurring. Upon review of evaluations that were conducted within these ten (10) LEAs, the AOE concluded that no students were deemed eligible for special education services as a result of inappropriate identification. Additionally, in all LEAs, appropriate consideration was given to the exclusionary factors (English proficiency, cultural and economic impacts and lack of instruction) cited in regulations regarding evaluations and disability determinations.

9.2.2 Review of LEA Policies, Procedures and Practices: Policies, procedures and practices that may help to prevent inappropriate identification were examined from each LEA identified with disproportionate representation. All of the LEAs reviewed had policies that reflected the use of reliable and valid diagnostic assessments; and had a policy that spoke directly to testing procedures or practices that would have a significant impact on disproportional representation by either race or ethnicity.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in

Specific Disability Categories

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	

FFY	2015	2016
Target	0%	0%
Data	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in
Specific Disability Categories
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Has the State established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? Yes No

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data
10	0	57	0%	0%	0%

Status
Met Target

Slippage
No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Disproportionate Representation is a measurement of whether the LEA's population of students on IEPs is statistically different than that of the total student population in terms of race or ethnicity. The analysis is done by comparing the proportion of each race or ethnicity in the IEP population with the same group on the total student population, using techniques which prevent false identification due to small counts. The analysis is conducted two ways. In the first, the total populations are compared. In the second, a similar comparison is done for each disability category.

Here is Vermont's current state analysis associated with Disproportionate Representation:

- The calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.):
 - VT uses risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, and alternate risk ratio
 - VT analyzes children with disabilities in total and the following 6 impairments
 - Autism;
 - Intellectual disabilities;
 - Specific learning disabilities;
 - Emotional disturbance;
 - Speech or language impairments;
 - Other health impairments;
 - Any minimum cell or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator):
 - Vermont uses these for rich ratio analysis is used, not to exclude districts
 - VT's minimum cell sized 3 and minimum N-sizes 10
 - The number of years of data used in the calculation:
 - VT's current state is 1 year of data
 - The threshold at disproportionate representation is identified:
 - VT has a 3 point criterion that works in combination to identify LEAs with significant disproportionality

A particular challenge for Vermont in defining disproportionate representation is the largely homogeneous nature of Vermont's student population. In both regular education and special education settings, at least 95 percent of the total student population has historically been reported as white. In addition, the counts of children receiving special education in each LEA are relatively small, averaging just over 200 students per LEA. Taken together, the homogeneity of the student population and relatively small child counts result in a situation where the addition of just one child into special education can create a large difference in the race/ethnicity composition of children receiving IDEA-B services in an LEA. To address these challenges, Vermont created three criteria designed to provide a meaningful, valid and reliable methodology for identifying LEAs with disproportionate representation.

Criterion 1:

LEA-level Weighted Risk Ratio > 3.0 or LEA-level Alternate Risk Ratio >3.0 or <.33 if the sum of the comparison group (all other race/ethnicity categories) used to calculate the Weighted Risk Ratio is <11.

- The LEA-level risk of a particular racial/ethnic group of students receiving special education services for a specific disability; and
- The risk for all other students in the LEA of receiving special education services for a specific disability weighted for the racial/ethnic composition of the state.
- When a weighted risk ratio is not appropriate because there are fewer than 11 students in the comparison group, Alternate Risk Ratios was first used in Vermont as an appropriate alternative beginning in FFY 2006. The Alternate Risk Ratio is not weighted for the racial/ethnic composition of the state.

Criterion 2:

Greater than 10 students receiving special education services for a specific disability in the special education race/ethnicity category in the LEA of analysis when examining overrepresentation or, beginning in FFY 2006, an "expected count" of >10 students in the special education race/ethnicity category if examining underrepresentation.

Risk ratios can be substantively impacted by the addition of as little as one student in a race/ethnicity category containing fewer than 11 students and become unreliable in identifying disproportionate representation. Furthermore, the Vermont Agency of Education (VT AOE) "small 'n' rule" prohibits public reporting of potentially personally identifying information where the number of students being reported on is less than or equal to 10. For these reasons, any single cell used for risk ratio analysis must contain at least **eleven** students when examining overrepresentation or an "expected count" of at least **eleven** students when examining underrepresentation.

Criterion 3

The difference between the actual count of special education students with a specific disability in a race/ethnicity category and the expected count of special education students with a specific disability in the race/ethnicity category is >10 when examining either overrepresentation or underrepresentation using Weighted or Alternate Risk Ratios.

This criterion prevents spurious identification of an LEA for having disproportionate representation when a combination of "small 'n'" sizes across race/ethnicity categories causes both the Weighted Risk Ratio and Alternate Risk Ratio to be unreliable. As noted above and in the Westat technical assistance documentation, when working with small numbers of students, the addition or subtraction of even one student in a particular race/ethnicity category can cause dramatic fluctuations in risk ratios, making them very difficult to interpret meaningfully. This criterion, in combination with the other two, provides a meaningful, valid and reliable methodology for identifying LEAs with disproportionate representation.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

To determine whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education was the result of inappropriate identification, the following activities, based on policies of the State of Vermont Agency of Education Special Education Monitoring Team (AOE), were completed:

Activities:

9.1 Letters from the special education monitoring team were sent to the ten (10) LEAs alerting them that their submitted Child Count data indicated suspected disproportionate overrepresentation within their special education population.

9.2 Copies of evaluations of those students impacted by the suspected disproportionate representation as well as any information regarding LEA policies, procedures and practices were requested from the LEAs and reviewed by the AOE.

9.2.1 Review of LEA Student Files: A sampling of files from students potentially impacted by this indicator were reviewed by the AOE in order to verify if inappropriate identification was occurring. Upon review of evaluations that were conducted within these ten (10) LEAs, the AOE concluded that no students were deemed eligible for special education services as a result of inappropriate identification. Additionally, in all LEAs, appropriate consideration was given to the exclusionary factors (English proficiency, cultural and economic impacts and lack of instruction) cited in regulations regarding evaluations and disability determinations.

9.2.2 Review of LEA Policies, Procedures and Practices: Policies, procedures and practices that may help to prevent inappropriate identification were examined from each LEA identified with disproportionate representation. All of the LEAs reviewed had policies that reflected the use of reliable and valid diagnostic assessments; and had a policy that spoke directly to testing procedures or practices that would have a significant impact on disproportional representation by either race or ethnicity.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in

Specific Disability Categories

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in

Specific Disability Categories

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		69.74%	81.78%	90.84%	82.50%	84.46%	91.83%	95.52%	92.11%	97.71%	98.48%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	97.89%	97.74%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
207	202	97.74%	100%	97.58%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	5
---	---

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Although initial evaluations for the five (5) children included in (a) but not included in (b) did not meet the 60 day timeline, the AOE has verified with each LEA that these five (5) evaluations have been completed and the eligibility meetings were held. The following represents the data for the LEAs in this year's sampling cycle:

LEA #1 completed 35 out of 36 initial evaluations on time. The one (1) late evaluation was completed within 61 days and was delayed due to a school break. This is not considered to be an acceptable delay and therefore was calculated into this LEA's local determinations issued in 2018.

LEA #2 completed 58 out of 59 initial evaluations on time. One (1) late evaluation was completed within 62 days and was delayed due to weather. This is not considered to be an acceptable delay and therefore was calculated into this LEA's local determinations issued in 2018. - NOTE: this SU was dissolved as of July 1, 2019 due to a statewide merger of LEAs and thus will not be reported in future APRs. Data will be reported as part of the new merged LEA.

LEA #3 completed 18 out of 20 initial evaluations on time. The one (1) late evaluation was completed within 61 days and was delayed due to weather. The other one (1) late evaluation was completed within 61 days and was delayed due to a school break. This is not considered to be an acceptable delay and therefore was calculated into this LEA's local determinations issued in 2018.

LEA #4 completed 48 out of 49 initial evaluations on time. The one (1) late evaluation was completed within 64 days and was delayed due to lack of available qualified staff to conduct the comprehensive assessment for which the LEA had to contract with non-school personnel - delay was due to that person's schedule. This is not considered to be an acceptable delay and therefore was calculated into this LEA's local determinations issued in 2018.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Below are the collection instructions sent to the LEAs prior to the first submission. The attached spreadsheet refers to the AOE developed data collection spreadsheet described in this section as **Indicator 11 Worksheet - Information collected from the LEA with each submission**. After each submission the AOE completes a feedback letter to each LEA and this is also included below as *Feedback Memo sent after each submission*.

INDICATOR 11 – Initial Evaluations

Complete the attached spreadsheet for each submission date for all initial evaluations conducted within the supervisory union. REMEMBER that if you have previously had an initial evaluation that was started but not completed for a particular submission, you must include the completed dates in your next submission.

NOV 1 Submission = Complete Worksheet for all initial evaluations from July 1 - October 15, YYYY

- If you have none during this submission period – SUBMIT worksheet with NONE for November in the first cell

FEB 1 Submission = Complete Worksheet for all initial evaluations from October 16, YYYY - Jan 15, YYYY

- If you have none during this submission period – SUBMIT worksheet with NONE for February in the first cell

APR 1 Submission = Complete Worksheet for all initial evaluations from January 16 – March 15, YYYY

- If you have none during this submission period – SUBMIT worksheet with NONE for April in the first cell

JUN 1 Submission = If April's Feedback Letter requests additional submissions, or there are issues of non-compliance that must be corrected:

- Complete spreadsheet for all initial evaluations from March 16 - May 15, YYYY **and** submit corrections for all issues of non-compliance found during the 20YY-20YY monitoring cycle.

Indicator 11 Worksheet - Information collected from the LEA with each submission

#	School	Student First Name	Student Last Name	Date of Consent to Evaluate	Eligibility Determination Mtg Date	Student Eligible?	# Days Eval Completed Formula-do not type in column	Compliant Formula-do not type in this column	Reason evaluation exceeded 60 days
1							0	Yes/No	

Feedback Memo sent after each submission

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Thank you for your submission regarding the IDEA Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicators. The federal and state target for these indicators/submissions is 100% compliance. What follows is the monitoring team's feedback and requirements for the next submission.

General Submission Information

The AOE uses the Office 365 platform and cannot accept Google Links for submissions, therefore please submit in the form of Excel Spreadsheets or PDF documents only. If someone other than yourself is submitting these documents, please make sure they are aware of the submission requirements. **Make sure you submit indicators 11 to the AOE.SpecialEd@vermont.gov email by the due date for each submission period.**

Indicator # 11 – Child Find/Initial Evaluation Timelines

The initial evaluation and a report shall be issued within 60 days from either the date parental consent is received by the LEA or the date on the prior written notice that informs parents the LEA will be conducting a record review as the sole basis for the initial evaluation.

Feedback from X DATE submission

XX out of XX (XX %) of submissions were found to have an initial evaluation completed within 60 days of parental consent.

Additional Feedback on individual instances of non-compliance: This is where the monitoring team includes feedback on specific student level instances of non-compliance, or offers differentiated technical assistance as appropriate.

Requirements for next submission due **no later than DATE**

Complete the Indicator 11 Worksheet for all initial evaluations completed, or started and not yet completed from **X date through X date**. If you have none during this submission period – SUBMIT the worksheet with NONE in the first cell. **If you had pending results listed in the XDate feedback, please include the completed evaluation information for this submission period.**

At the end of each submission data analyzed to develop feedback letters for each LEA. It is also used to determine if technical assistance is needed prior to the next submission. Below is an example of the summary sheet used to analyze the data.

Indicator 11 Summary Sheet	November			February			April			June		
LEA Name	Number of Submissions	Total # Compliant	%	Number of Submissions	Total # Compliant	%	Number of Submissions	Total # Compliant	%	Number of Submissions	Total # Compliant	%

 Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

These four (4) incidents were the result of evaluation procedures in one LEA (ANWSU). The AOE has verified through a updated record review of policies and procedures that those procedures were subsequently changed and the issue related to evaluator scheduling has been eliminated. The AOE also verified that the LEA area of non-compliance was corrected within one year from identification and that this is not a systemic issue. The AOE subsequently verified that the LEA policies and procedures are now aligned with 34 CFR § 300.301(d).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

As reported in FFY2016, the four (4) individual instances of non-compliance from FFY2016, were verified by the AOE through an updated desk audit of LEA policies and procedures as well as a subsequent review of individual IEPs. Through this updated review, all four (4) students did receive an initial evaluation and no student was denied FAPE as a result of delayed evaluations. The AOE has subsequently verified that the LEA policies and procedures are now aligned with 34 CFR § 300.301(d) and consider the issue to be resolved.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY2014	3	null	0

Adjusted number of findings

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

These three (3) incidents were the result of evaluation procedures in one LEA (WSWSU). The AOE has verified through an updated review of policies and procedures that those procedures were subsequently changed and the issue related to initial evaluations has been eliminated. The AOE also verified that the LEA area of non-compliance was corrected within one year from identification and that this is not a systemic issue. The AOE subsequently verified that the LEA policies and procedures are now aligned with 34 CFR § 300.301(d).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

As reported in FFY2014, the three (3) individual instances of non-compliance from FFY2014, were verified by the AOE through an updated desk audit of LEA policies and procedures as well as a subsequent review of individual IEPs. Through this updated review, all three (3) students did receive an initial evaluation and no student was denied FAPE as a result of delayed evaluations. The AOE has subsequently verified that the LEA policies and procedures are now aligned with 34 CFR § 300.301(d) and consider the issue to be resolved.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		86.44%	97.33%	99.27%	98.80%	99.70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	40
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	0
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	40
d. Number of children for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	0
e. Number of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	40	40	100%	100%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f	0
--	---

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Notification letters were sent to the six(6) LEAs slated for FFY2017 Compliance Monitoring which for this indicator involves the LEA completion of an AOE-developed spreadsheet. The AOE requested from each LEA the child's name, date birth, the date of referral to Part B, date of the transition meeting, as well as the date an IEP was developed and the date of parental consent for the provision of the IEP services. This spreadsheet was submitted at three time periods over the course of the school year and were specifically due on November 1, 2017, February 1, 2018 and April 1, 2018.

Despite some late referrals from Part C, 100% percentage of children referred to Part B from Part C had an IEP in place by the child's third birthday and therefore are considered compliant by the AOE. In addition, the Part C Coordinator and the Early Learning Program Director were notified of all incidents of late referrals in the FFY2017 compliance monitoring cycle.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						22.60%	55.44%	94.44%	57.75%	74.04%	74.34%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	91.49%	88.03%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
79	79	88.03%	100%	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Data Collection Method

Late Summer/Early September – An email is sent to LEAs in the monitoring cycle. Email contains the state-developed mandatory training presentation (or webinar) on indicator 13. This training can be conducted by LEA at a staff meeting as long as it is completed prior to requirements for November 1st submission. This email also provides instruction on how to complete the attached NTACT checklist. (Ind 13 Accessible Checklist NTACT VT.docx and Indicator 13 Tip Sheet VT.doc - are included as attachments in the email and in attachment section below):

LEAs are required to submit a minimum of **(10) compliant post-secondary plans over the course of this year's monitoring cycle**. Additional post-secondary transition plans may be requested depending on the size of the student population ages 16-21, or if the post-secondary plans submitted do not meet the 100% compliance requirement. Please review the feedback letters carefully for information and details on additional submissions or requirements for corrections of non-compliance.

Use attachment Ind 13 Accessible Checklist NTACT VT.docx and include as the completed self-review along with any corresponding post-secondary transitions plan for students age 16-21. Do NOT submit plans for students younger than 16.

NOV 1 Submission = Submit up to (10) post-secondary transition plans from (date webinar emailed to you) - October 15 YYYY

If you have none during this submission period – SUBMIT with NONE for November in the body of the email

FEB 1 Submission = Submit post-secondary transition plans from Oct 16, YYYY - Jan 15, YYYY until a **cumulative total** of 10 has been reached.

If you have none during this submission period – SUBMIT with NONE for February in the body of the email

APR 1 Submission = Submit post-secondary transition plans from Jan 16 – March 15, YYYY until a **cumulative total** of 10 has been reached

If you have none during this submission period – SUBMIT with NONE for April in the body of the email

JUN 1 Submission = If your Feedback Letter requests additional submissions, or there are issues of non-compliance that must be corrected:

Submit requested additional post-secondary transition plans from March 16 – May 15, YYYY **and** submit corrections for all issues of non-compliance for the year.

AOE File Review

After each submission, data is analyzed to develop feedback letters for each LEA. It is also used to determine if technical assistance is needed prior to the next submission.

After each submission is received by the AOE, staff conducts a file review of the self-review NTACT checklist and the IEPs submitted by the LEA. AOE Staff use the same NTACT checklist in its review. Staff also complete a state-designed spreadsheet for all submissions (included in this section). The AOE developed this spreadsheet for tracking Indicator 13 submissions from LEAs. An x is placed in the columns in areas 1-8 to show compliance; any other mark triggers a color coded non-compliance calculation to identify any specific need for immediate technical assistance in specific areas related to education/training, employment, or independent living. Below is an example of the spreadsheet used to analyze the data.

Perm Number	DOB or Grade	Submission Date	Compliant (Y or N)	Timely (Y or N)	Final Correction Date	LEA Submission(SU/SD)	1			2			3			4			
							Attend Student	Education/Training	Employment	Attend Agency	Education/Training	Employment	Independent Living	Assessments & Summary	Education/Training	Employment	Independent Living	Post Secondary Goals	Education/Training

Feedback sent after each submission from LEA

Thank you for your submission regarding the IDEA Part B Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicators. The federal and state target for these indicators/submissions is 100% compliance. What follows is the monitoring team's feedback and requirements for the next submission.

General Submission Information

The AOE uses the Office 365 platform and cannot accept Google Links for submissions, therefore please submit in the form of Excel Spreadsheets or PDF documents only. If someone other than yourself is submitting these documents, please make sure they are aware of the submission requirements. **Make sure you submit indicators 13 to the AOE.SpecialEd@vermont.gov email by the due date for each submission period.**

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator # 13 – Post-Secondary Transitions

You are required to submit a minimum of **(10) compliant post-secondary plans over the course of this year's monitoring cycle**. Additional post-secondary transition plans may be requested depending on the size of your student population ages 16-21, or if the post-secondary plans submitted do not meet the 100% compliance requirement. DO NOT submit plans out of the specified date range or for students younger than 16.

Feedback from X Date submission

XX out of XX (XX %) of the submitted post-secondary transition plans were found to be in compliance. You have submitted a year-to-date total of XX post-secondary transition plans for review and have **(not yet)** reached the required minimum for this year's monitoring cycle.

Additional Feedback on individual instances of non-compliance: This is where the monitoring team includes feedback on specific student level instances of non-compliance, or offers differentiated technical assistance as appropriate.

Requirements for next submission due no later than DATE

Submit any newly developed postsecondary transition plans developed between **Date X and Date X**. This includes a completed self-review NTACT Indicator 13 Checklist for each student. If you have none during this submission period – submit your email with NONE for indicator 13 in the body of the message. **If you had non-compliant transition plans listed in the X Date feedback, please make corrections and resubmit for this submission period.**

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

Yes No

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

This current method of data collection and analysis, allows the AOE to provide LEAs with more timely technical assistance and support to meet the compliance requirements for indicator 13. In addition the timing between submissions is three (3) months which allows the AOE time to identify potential non-compliance areas and LEAs are able to verify validity of data and/or make corrections to potential non-compliance prior to the AOE issuing any formal findings. All incidents of pre-findings are able to be corrected by the LEA within this three (3) month window with decreasing pre-findings in subsequent submissions during the monitoring cycle. This practice of not reporting on pre-findings as well as providing shorter feedback loops has increased the AOE's compliance percentage from 88.03% in FFY2016 to 100% in FFY2017.

Vermont conducts monitoring for this indicator in a sampling cycle of 8-10 LEAs per year. As of FFY2016 all LEAs in the state had participated in at least one compliance monitoring cycle and were aware of the state's compliance expectations related to post-secondary transition plans. FFY2017 is the beginning of repeat monitoring for the original sampling cycle. This familiarity with the process is also part of both LEAs and the AOE meeting targets for this indicator.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
14	14	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY2016 the AOE neglected to include in its report that the majority of these fourteen (14) incidences of non-compliance were related to geographic locations within the state where the LEAs did not have a public high school but tutored students to designated independent secondary schools in those areas. In addition to technical assistance related to this indicator, LEAs were also provided with support around developing clear roles/responsibilities between LEA/Independent schools for special education students tutored to non-public high schools. In addition, LEAs were also reminded that it is not the independent school who is responsible for student IEPs and services, but the sending LEA.

The AOE has verified through updated record reviews that this issue has been resolved and that LEAs are correctly implementing regulatory requirements related to post-secondary transition for students with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR § 300.320(b)-(c).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In a subsequent review of individual IEPs, the AOE verified that all fourteen (14) incidents of individual non-compliance reported in FFY2016 were corrected within one (1) year of being identified. As a result of the subsequent reviews, the AOE determined that no student was denied FAPE by any non-compliant LEA.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY2014	39	47	0

Adjusted number of findings

Explanation of Alternate Data

The explanation for the number 47 in the data boxes is a combination of FFY2015 (8 instances) plus FFY2014 (39 instances) of non-compliance. GRADS data box format does not permit adding an additional row for FFY2015 data.

Data and OSEP 09-02 Language for FFY2015:

In a review of updated IEPs, the AOE verified in a subsequent desk audit that all eight (8) incidents of individual non-compliance reported in FFY2015 were corrected within one (1) year of being identified. The AOE also reviewed updated policies and procedures for that year's sampling of LEAs to ensure that they were correctly implementing regulatory requirements related to post-secondary transition of students with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR § 300.320(b)-(c). As a result of the subsequent reviews, the AOE determined that this was no systemic issue and no individual student was denied FAPE by any non-compliant LEA.

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In FFY2014 not all LEAs in the state had participated in the compliance monitoring cycle for this indicator and therefore the AOE only met 74.34% of the 100% target. The AOE provided technical assistance to these LEAs in the sampling cycle for FFY2014 and verified through an updated desk audit of both IEPs and LEA policies that all issues were resolved within one year of identification, so that LEAs are now correctly implementing regulatory requirements related to post-secondary transition for students with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR § 300.320(b)-(c).

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

In a record review of updated IEPs, the AOE verified that all thirty-nine (39) incidents of individual non-compliance reported in FFY2014 were corrected within one (1) year of being identified. As a result of the subsequent reviews, the AOE determined that no student was denied FAPE by any non-compliant LEA.

OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFYs 2016, 2015, and 2014 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFYs 2016, 2015, and 2014 is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that 14 findings identified in FFY 2016, the eight findings identified in FFY 2015, and the 39 findings identified in FFY 2014 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2016, FFY 2015, and FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2017, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017, although its FFY 2017 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2017.

Required Actions

--

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							24.25%	24.25%	24.25%	24.25%	24.25%
		Data						24.22%	16.36%	17.56%	15.34%	50.38%	48.89%
B	2009	Target ≥							56.50%	56.50%	56.50%	56.50%	56.50%
		Data						56.40%	48.33%	48.29%	47.72%	70.61%	62.22%
C	2009	Target ≥							72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%
		Data						71.97%	57.25%	65.85%	59.66%	77.48%	73.33%

	FFY	2015	2016
A	Target ≥	24.25%	24.25%
	Data	38.79%	22.22%
B	Target ≥	56.50%	56.50%
	Data	69.63%	64.81%
C	Target ≥	72.00%	72.00%
	Data	80.84%	74.07%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target A ≥	24.25%	24.25%
Target B ≥	56.50%	56.50%
Target C ≥	72.00%	72.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	155.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	34.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	63.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	13.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	12.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	34.00	155.00	22.22%	24.25%	21.94%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	97.00	155.00	64.81%	56.50%	62.58%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	122.00	155.00	74.07%	72.00%	78.71%	Met Target	No Slippage

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

- Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

According to the National Post-School Outcomes Response Calculator, Vermont's Post-Secondary data is representative of the state with regard to minority status, English Language Learner status, and the grouped disabilities not pulled out separately.

The Response Calculator is a tool designed by the National Center so that states can input key demographic data on the Respondent and Target Leaver Groups. The Response Calculator compares proportions between the two groups on demographic variables and identifies where important differences exist between the two groups on those variables. The demographic variable categories are:

- Specific Learning Disability (LD)
- Emotional Disability (ED)
- Intellectual Disability (ID)
- All Other disability groups (AO)
- Gender
- Minority
- English Language Learners (ELL)
- Dropout

If there is a difference of less than plus or minus 3 percent in any demographic variable category, that category is considered representative. For FFY2017, the differences between Target Leaver and Respondent Groups in Vermont were as follows:

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Target Leaver Representation	32.45%	25.60%	8.37%	33.59%	34.47%	8.11%	0.76%	23.95%
Respondent Representation	38.06%	16.13%	12.26%	33.55%	30.32%	5.81%	0.65%	7.10%
Difference	5.62%	-9.47%	3.89%	-0.04%	-4.15%	-2.31%	-0.12%	-16.86%

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? No

Describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Vermont attempts to contact ALL students who left special education in the reporting timeframe but the size of this group rarely goes over 1,000 students. In the coming year, the new Part B data manager will work to clarify the instructions used for the collection of this data in an attempt to get more complete and useful contact information. The data manager and contractor will also work together to consider what edits we can make to the communication cycle to collect more data. We feel if more data is available for analysis that representativeness of the other groups will increase as well.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes
Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2017 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2016 OSEP response

Vermont did the work to understand the representativeness of the data collected for this indicator. Vermont utilized the National Post-School Outcomes Response Calculator to do this analysis and have posted the results in the FFY17 Data tab of this report.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2018 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Data		55.00%	25.00%	33.33%	83.33%	66.67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	60.00%	60.00%
Data	100%	0% 0.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	60.00%	60.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions
FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	1	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/8/2018	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	9	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
1	9	0%	60.00%	11.11%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2017. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 16: Mediation

Historical Data and Targets

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			70.00%	73.00%	76.00%	79.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%
Data		63.00%	90.91%	88.89%	80.00%	87.50%	86.45%	72.34%	86.67%	76.00%	83.33%

FFY	2015	2016
Target ≥	82.00%	82.00%
Data	70.00%	91.67%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	82.00%	82.00%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:

- Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)
- Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)
- Statewide Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings
- Vermont Family Network (VFN)
- Other parties who have expressed an interest in providing input

Additional improvement activity information was collected from stakeholder groups including educators as well as The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The AOE continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community as needed.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 16: Mediation

FFY 2017 Data

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	4	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	13	null
SY 2017-18 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/8/2018	2.1 Mediations held	24	null

FFY 2017 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
4	13	24	91.67%	82.00%	70.83%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Reasons for Slippage

Our panel of experienced mediators has not changed, neither has our process of assigning mediators. We looked at the 7 cases that did not reach an agreement after mediation was held, and considering this analysis we don't think this is a systemic issue. The only trend is that 3 of the 7 mediations held (related to due process) were ultimately dismissed by the Hearing Officer.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 16: Mediation

Required Actions from FFY 2016

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2014

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target ≥		17.00%	6.70%	6.70%	7.20%
Data	18.00%	6.70%	14.29%	13.04%	5.30%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

Explanation of Changes

Vermont students in grades 3 through 9 take the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC) which is a set of computer adaptive tests for English Language Arts and Mathematics developed by a national consortium currently made up of 15 states, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Bureau of Indian Education. This was the fourth year Vermont students, statewide, participated in the SBAC.

Due to small n-size in previous reports, the AOE has been monitoring the larger than expected proficiency numbers and this year's 5.3% is closer to what would be expected with Vermont's small n-size. The AOE believes continued scale-up activities and increased n-size will move statewide proficiency rates closer to target.

A more detailed explanation of changes can be found in the attached report.

FFY 2018 Target

FFY	2018
Target ≥	7.70%

Key: Blue – Data Update

Description of Measure

SEE ATTACHED

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

SEE ATTACHED

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Introduction

Prior to and after the OSEP Summer Technical Assistance meeting of August 2014, the State Systemic Improvement Plan information was shared with administration and staff at the Vermont Agency of Education (VT AOE), additional state agencies and the field. The plan was discussed at a VT AOE leadership meeting and with staff from the General Supervision and Monitoring and Integrated Support for Learning teams so that Vermont Agency staff would be familiar with the requirements and process. Additionally, information about the plan was shared with the directors of the Vermont Family Network, the Vermont Principals Association, the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators, and members of the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Follow up meetings were held with members of each organization.

An overview of the plan was presented at regional special education administrators meetings in September 2013 with updated information continuing through June 2014. The meetings were attended by special education administrators from the majority of school districts in the state and representatives of the Agency. Attendees were asked significant questions and to contribute to plan development.

The Vermont Special Education Advisory Council dedicated half their meeting days in November 2013 and January, March, April, October and November 2014 to discuss the SSIP data, potential, and final SIMR and activities. Council members offered critical questions and made suggestions for targets and outcomes.

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance.

In March 2014, agency staff attended the RCC training for a better understanding of the process and activities involved in developing the SSIP. Following this training, the AOE steering committee reviewed additional APR indicators (#3) and narrowed data to reflect the most needy areas of that indicator. Based upon that review, staff chose to review additional data surrounding each of the potential SIMRs to determine the most appropriate. Throughout 2014, data was reviewed with the internal steering committee, the Special Education Advisory Committee, data staff, and the local RRC representative to support the choice of the final SIMR.

As part of this broad data analysis, staff and stakeholders reviewed the following:

1. APR and 618 data on allowable indicators 1, 2, and 14 for consideration of a preliminary SIMR beginning in January 2014 with constituencies within and outside the AOE.
2. Upon review of the SECT data and graduation data, the steering committee revisited the Annual Performance Report and focused on Indicator 3, Math Assessment outcomes for students identified as ED.

The State used multiple data sources in its data analysis to identify root causes contributing to low performance. For preliminary discussion and final choice of a SIMR, the following data sources were used as illustrated by the attached charts:

1. Placement data;
2. Assessment performance data;
3. Primary disability assessment data;
4. Geographic data

Data was disaggregated and reviewed by the steering committee and agency staff across multiple variables including:

1. Graduation rates by cohort;
2. geographic area across the state;
3. disability category;
4. gender;
5. participation and proficiency rates

The State reviewed data that would inform potential SIMRs for compliance and potential influence on improvement. Questions regarding applicability, validity, and reliability were addressed. Targets and accompanying data which did not meet SSIP criteria were eliminated.

The State reviewed initial root causes. These included items germane to the special education process (possible over-identification), curriculum, instruction, teacher quality, parenting skills, professional learning, geography, poverty, and integration with other state agencies or community service groups. It was determined that additional data on root causes is required to fully assess causal factors affecting students identified in the SIMR. The plan and timelines for collecting this additional data is to construct, distribute and analyze surveys sent to partners during 2015 to obtain additional qualitative

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

and quantitative data on root causes at the state and local level. This information will be analyzed and appropriate improvement plans drawn mid-2015 based upon the analysis of those findings and to report those results in Phase II, due February 1, 2016.

The State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns.

In the consideration of compliance data, no potential barriers to improvement are seen as we do not have any compliance data which relates to this SIMR. Data is continually being reviewed for quality. One issue which arose is that the proportion of IEP students reported as proficient for 2013-14 was incomplete due to the lack of data reported by schools which piloted the SBAC during sy 2013. Therefore, results were skewed positively. To adjust for this and provide a more accurate representation of math assessment results, AOE incorporated additional data from the 2012-13 school year. The State of Vermont will be utilizing SSIS as the reporting group for SBAC.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Vermont considered all of the major initiatives across the state in order to analyze its current infrastructure. A description of those that are directly related to the Vermont SSIP/SIMR is included here. Documents related to those initiatives are attached.

The purpose of the Vermont Education Quality Standards (EQS) is to "ensure that all students in Vermont public schools are afforded educational opportunities that are substantially equal in quality, and enable them to achieve or exceed the standards approved by the State Board of Education. These rules are designed to ensure continuous improvement in the student performance, instruction and leadership to enable students to attain rigorous standards in high quality programs." There is an intentional shift from inputs to outcomes; from a focus on courses and Carnegie units to a focus on proficiency. Sections of EQS related to and aligned with the Vermont SSIP/SIMR include but are not limited to: (see the attached EQS document for details)

2120 Curriculum and Instruction: Section 2120.1 Classroom practices shall include a range of research-based instructional practices that most effectively improve student learning, as identified by national and Vermont guidance and locally collected and analyzed student data.

2121 Professional Resources: Section 2121.5 Describes a tiered system of support: "...each school shall ensure that a tiered system of academic and behavioral supports is in place to assist all students in working toward attainment of the standards.

2122 Learning Environment: Section 2122.1 Each school shall maintain a safe, orderly, civil, flexible and positive learning environment, which is free from hazing, harassment and bullying, and based on sound instructional and classroom management practices and clear discipline and attendance policies that are consistently and effectively enforced.

2123 State and Local Comprehensive Assessment System: 2123.2(f) Each supervisory union shall develop, and each school shall implement, a local comprehensive assessment system that provide data that informs decisions regarding instruction, professional learning, and educational resources and curriculum.

2124 Reporting of Results: Teachers shall have access to data on individual students whom they teach and aggregate data on student and system performance results.

2125 Continuous Improvement Plan: A continuous improvement plan shall be developed and implemented in each public school district. The plan shall be designed to improve the performance of all students enrolled in the district.

2126 System for Determining Compliance with EQS: As required, every two years, the Secretary shall determine whether students in each Vermont public school are provided educational opportunities substantially equal to those provided in other public schools.

Vermont is currently in year 3 of the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) 4. Vermont has been implementing MTSS through the SPDG 4 since October 2012. It will run through September 2017 with the anticipation of an approved no cost one year carryover. Vermont is well positioned due to the confluence of the implementation and scaling up of the Early/K-12 (SPDG 3) and the current Early/K-12 MTSS projects (SPDG 4). It has specifically focused on the Foundations of Early Learning, VEL, K-12 RTI and ViiM (VT Integrated Instructional Model). Early in 2012, Vermont recognized the need for a systemic and sustainable state personnel development plan. A plan was developed which identified and addressed the state and local needs for personnel preparation and learning, and met the requirements of IDEA section 612(a)(14) and section 635(a)(8) and (9). It was specifically based on the assessment of state and local needs that identified critical aspects and areas in need of improvement related to the ongoing preparation, training, and professional learning needs of personnel. The VT MTSS project demonstrated the following priority requirements: 1) the use of evidence-based professional learning strategies that will support the implementation of evidence-based practices and result in improved outcomes for students with disabilities; 2) the provision of ongoing assistance to personnel receiving professional learning that supports the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity; and 3) use of technology to more efficiently and effectively provide ongoing professional learning to personnel, including personnel in rural areas. Building on the successes of the current SPDG pilot sites and the assessed needs of the state, the VT AOE is continuing the VT MTSS initiative but is broadening its scope and scale up to include math as a content area and increase and improve the family engagement component. These two areas are directly connected to and aligned with improving math learning outcomes for students with an emotional disability.

The VT MTSS professional learning model will focus on five critical elements: 1) ensuring that there is sufficient capacity to provide evidence-based professional learning at early childhood, SU/SD and school levels; 2) providing local and regional TA and coaching based on data-driven needs; 3) utilizing innovative technology and distance learning to increase opportunities for TA and the

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

development of professional learning communities (PLC); 4) aligning the SPDG professional learning system with other AOE initiatives; and 5) employing implementation science principles as the core of the vtMTSS model. These critical elements align with the Vermont SIMR. See the attached MTSS Field Guide for details.

In Vermont, there are currently eleven schools in four supervisory unions that are participating in the School Wide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT). The SWIFT domains and features are the building blocks of effective inclusive education. The domains of SWIFT (Administrative Leadership, Multi-tiered Systems of Support, Integrated Educational Framework, Family and Community Engagement, and Inclusive Policy Structure and Practice) and its features directly support the work of improving math learning outcomes for students with emotional disabilities. Implementation science drives the work of the SWIFT Center by promoting research-based approaches to achieve improved academic and social outcomes for all students.

An MTSS framework should be used to guide instruction, by using effective general education strategies with all students and increasing the level of support for some students based on needs identified through screening and progress monitoring. (Copeland & Cosbey, 2008; Sailor, 2009a, 2009b)

Implementing School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) resulted in decreases in office discipline referrals, suspensions, and disruptive behaviors and increases in pro-social behavior (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010; Sailor, Wolf, Choi, & Roger, 2009; Sailor, et al, 2006)

Vermont is in its seventh year of implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). Since 2007, the VTPBIS State Team has collaborated to support schools in PBIS implementation and sustainability. PBIS is a framework for preventing and responding to problem behavior within a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) to meet the learning needs of all students within a positive school climate. Vermont schools implementing MTSS align their systems, data and practices to promote both behavioral and academic success. The goal of PBIS in Vermont is to provide high quality professional learning opportunities to improve school climate and support positive educational outcomes for all students.

Since 2007, the VTPBIS State Team has built capacity for PBIS implementation and sustainability through a system of support and feedback loops between schools, SU/SDs, and the state. Additional sustainability efforts include:

- Actively promoting this framework and its alignment with multi-tiered systems of support for academics;
- Committing personnel and financial resources to professional learning;
- Recognizing schools for achieving exemplar distinction;
- Utilizing online data systems for analysis and decision making; and
- Collaborating with the Vermont Agency of Human Services to promote the integration of mental health supports within a multi-tiered framework for behavior.

The Vermont SIMR is fully supported by the braiding of PBIS and MTSS. Students with emotional disabilities in grades 3-5 will be the focus and the strategies for improving their behavior, emotional, and academic needs will be implemented with fidelity.

Phase I of the SSIP involves several representatives.

Vermont Part C partners will align their work (social and emotional development) with the Part B implementation of the SSIP. Both Part B and Part C teams will attend the IDC conference in late April to plan for the transition of students from Part C to Part B through the lens of improving outcomes for students with emotional disabilities.

Agency of Education staff have been involved in the determination of the SIMR. AOE Math and Behavior consultants have been involved in meetings and will be instrumental in supporting the work of improving math outcomes for students with emotional disabilities. Data experts from AOE have also added valuable input toward the selection of the SIMR.

The Vermont Special Education Advisory Council has been involved in discussions of the SSIP and have supported the work in determining the SIMR.

The Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators has also been brought into the SIMR discussions and has provided feedback around the target. They intend to be involved with the SSIP as plans for implementation are scaled up.

The Vermont Family Network is involved in the choosing of the SIMR. They will continue as stakeholders. Their specific role will be determined as Vermont moves ahead with implementation plans.

Children's Mental Health staff have had input on the selection of the SIMR. Their involvement will be increased as Vermont moves into Phase II of the SSIP.

Integrated Family Services will be involved in the implementation of SSIP.

Potentially, as Vermont moves forward with plans for the SSIP, more stakeholders will be added to the plan. The deeper data analysis and root cause analysis will likely support the need for a larger group of stakeholders who can help with the details of improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

To improve proficiency of math performance for students identified as having an emotional disability in grades 3-5. The SIMR is aligned with APR Indicator #3 Math proficiency. It is intended that throughout the life of the SSIP and through the employment of coherent improvement strategies, the math proficiency levels for students in grades 3, 4, and 5, identified as having an emotional disability, will increase to 20%, as measured by the SBAC, by 2018.

Description

The State has a SIMR and the SIMR is aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator:

Vermont SIMR: To improve proficiency of math performance for students identified as having an emotional disability in grades 3-5. The SIMR is aligned with APR Indicator #3 Math proficiency. It is intended that throughout the life of the SSIP and through the employment of coherent improvement strategies, the math proficiency levels for students in grades 3, 4, and 5, identified as having an emotional disability, will increase to 20%, as measured by the SBAC, by 2018.

Background Information

The number of students with emotional disabilities in the state of Vermont is significantly above the national average of 6.31% at 16.03%. The proficiency rates on the math assessment for this group of students is significantly low with only 12.96% of students with ED proficient on the statewide math assessment. The SIMR will target math proficiency outcomes for those students identified as having an emotional disability and will impact outcomes for those students over the life of the SSIP. Data reviewed illustrated flat or declining trends in overall math proficiency for this group: high 17.16% in 2009-10 with unreliable data continually decreasing to a low of 12.96% in 2013 with reliable data for students identified as ED across all grade levels in the state. The selection of this SIMR was due to the high need of improvement for this population of students in the content area of math. The SIMR is in harmony with the AOE commitment to equity, education, and improvement for all students and its commitment to activities and programs that increase positive outcomes in the area of mathematics for all students.

As part of the broad data analysis, each stakeholder group reviewed APR and 618 data, evaluated current activities, proposed enlarged staff meetings, and determined potential SIMRs. Those potential SIMRs included high school graduation rates, the use of Personalized Learning Plans (PLP), post school outcomes, and assessment outcomes of both math and reading. Further data analysis and discussion ruled out PLP's and post school outcomes due to the lack of current baseline data and full implementation not beginning for another 2 years.

Further review of state trends over time, local programs, and national trends revealed that improving proficiency rates in the area of mathematics was the more significant need. As Vermont has the highest percentage in the nation of students identified as ED, the data for this disability category surrounding student achievement in math was of particular interest. Continued data analysis indicated that students with disabilities identified as ED have a high need for improvement of their math outcomes on standardized assessments at grades 3 through 8 and 11. Root cause investigation for this finding would require further in-depth qualitative analysis, continued quantitative analysis and significant coordination with the field over a substantial period of time. It is anticipated that other sources of data will be used to evaluate the progress of students in both academic and behavioral areas.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

The improvement strategies for Vermont were selected based on current initiatives and their goals as they relate to the SIMR. Please refer to the attached [VT AOE SSIP Implementation Framework](#) document for descriptions of how the improvement strategies were selected and details of how the work will focus on the content area of math for students with emotional disabilities in grades 3-5 as they relate to the SSIP/SIMR.

Goal #2 of the SPDG is intended to scale up implementation of a coordinated, system of school-age personnel development that will increase the capacity of school personnel to establish and use a multi-tiered model of evidence-based instruction, intervention, and assessment to improve the progress and performance of all students, including those with disabilities. Professional learning is based on the implementation science research, adult learning principles, and Professional Learning Standards developed by Learning Forward.

Vermont has begun to work on the root causes for the high rate of students with emotional disabilities and their related low performance scores in the area of math. Initial results reveal that further work needs to be done to determine why these rates are at these levels but also to determine how best to improve student outcomes for this specific population of students. The Vermont AOE will coordinate this work with Children's Mental Health agency, Integrated Family Services, Vermont Part C partners, administrators, teachers and parents.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan
Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Cascades A and B reflect Vermont's logic model or practice-policy communication loop. They are based on Implementation Science and illustrate how the state plans to implement and sustain evidence-based innovations that will improve the math skills of students with Emotional Disabilities in grades 3-5. Moreover, the support and feedback loops summarize how the state intends to support continuous improvement cycles for the effective implementation of these evidence-based practices.

Cascade A, Support Theory of Action, illustrates how Vermont's Agency of Education and the Agency of Human Services will collaborate at a policy level so that local mental health agencies and Vermont Supervisory Unions and School Districts (SU/SD) can work together to embed evidence-based mental health supports into our schools. More specifically, the support loops illustrate the levels at which supports for effective practices will be provided so as to facilitate fidelity of implementation. The feedback loops illustrate how feedback and data on implementation efforts will make their way from children and families back up to policy-makers.

Likewise, Cascade B, Program Theory of Action, illustrates how the Vermont Agency of Education will work with national and state level content experts to train internal coaches at the SU/SD level in the evidence-based math innovations and practices, and how those SU/SD level coaches will then work with school leaders to embed the practices into classrooms to support students. The feedback loops serve to provide data and feedback at each level of the cascade.

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Phase I for the Vermont Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) includes a Statewide Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) that focuses on improving learning outcomes in the content area of math for students in grades 3, 4, and 5, who have an emotional disability. The original plan was focused on those students in the 78 schools already implementing the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). Upon further review, help from technical assistance organizations, and with input from a large stakeholder group, it was decided that Vermont should focus on a much smaller group of students in order to focus on those evidence-based practices and strategies that are successful in improving outcomes for this specific population of students. After implementation of the SSIP in a group of up to 4 pilot schools, data would be analyzed to identify the reasons for each school's success. Those practices and strategies would then be used to support other schools in their goal to improve math outcomes for students with emotional disabilities in grades 3, 4, and 5.

Phase II of the SSIP in Vermont is described in detail in the following pages. The plan will describe how the infrastructure of the Agency of Education has collaborated to support the schools to be chosen for implementation, how the Agency will support the implementation of evidence-based practices within those Vermont schools, and how the Agency will know that their efforts are making changes for students with disabilities through the development of an outside evaluation plan.

Phase II Component #1: Infrastructure Development

Component #1 Elements

1(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support LEAs to implement and scale up EBPs to improve the SIMR for children with disabilities.

The Vermont State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Leadership Team has been working with several other teams both within and outside of the Agency of Education (AOE) in order to develop a solid state infrastructure that will support and maintain the implementation of the SSIP for many years to come. A close and detailed look at other Vermont statewide initiatives has enabled the team to consider the alignment of those evidence-based practices already in place.

The current work in Vermont includes the implementation of Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS), Statewide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS), Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Trauma-informed Schools, Act 264 (Coordination of Educational & Social Services), and math instruction/interventions that specifically align with the goals of the Vermont SSIP. These systems, which are already in place, will be integrated with and supported by the SSIP to confirm that the pilot schools are developing coherent and integrated approaches to the systemic implementation of these practices.

Improvement 1 – Leverage the Agency's current MTSS technical assistance: Vermont will be integrating MTSS and SWIFT tools and protocols to create a uniform research-based approach to the MTSS framework and infrastructure development in Vermont schools. This will ensure that the research behind Implementation Science is integrated into MTSS training and coaching support for schools in Vermont. Vermont's MTSS External Systems Coaches, the Agency's technical assistants working with sites to fully implement VT MTSS, will work with the Agency to support those MTSS schools involved in the work of the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). By working with the MTSS External Systems Coaches, the State can then build on existing relationships, communication, designated meetings, and previous professional learning opportunities to extend its capacity.

Improvement 2 – Focus and integrate Act 46: Another area of integration will be through Act 46 which requires the Secretaries of Education and Human Services to develop a plan for maximizing collaboration and coordination between the agencies in delivering social services to Vermont public school students and their families. This scope of the work will be narrowed to support students with emotional disabilities (ED) as a statewide identified priority for Vermont schools.

Improvement 3 – Enhance coaching system and integrate it with other initiatives and systems: The Agency will support an embedded coaching model to achieve the sustainable learning and support needed to fully integrate the strategies outlined in the SSIP for each identified school. More specifically, the collaboration between the Agency of Education staff and the MTSS External System Coaches will facilitate the integration of professional learning opportunities and a school's access to statewide content focused coaches. This plan will guide the infrastructure development, personnel and leadership capacity development at the local school level for SSIP identified research-based practices in math, UDL and PBIS. Schools will be supported in the content areas identified as critical for the SSIP implementation through embedded professional coaching experts.

Improvement 4 – Whole system engagement for PIP-PEP: Key leadership individuals, working on behalf of Superintendents, Curriculum and Assessment Directors, Special Education Administrators, and Principals, will continue to work closely together through stakeholder input opportunities to ensure a coherent understanding and execution of the SSIP strategies in Vermont schools. These communication channels will pay particular attention to how (formative) lessons from the SSIP implementation effort may be harnessed to enhance ongoing/future SSIP implementation efforts and to capturing lessons for Policy-enabled Practice and Practice-informed Policy improvements.

1(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and initiatives in the State, including general and special education, which impact children with disabilities.

Vermont has, and always will, strive to increase both academic and behavioral outcomes for all students. Given the task of improving outcomes for students with disabilities through the SSIP, Vermont looked carefully at data, met with internal AOE staff, and gathered input from stakeholders to determine how to better align the current improvement plans and initiatives across the state. It was decided that Vermont would draw upon the many frameworks already in place. These include: MTSS, PBIS, SWIFT, UDL, the Vermont Education Quality Standards (EQS), Personalized Learning and Flexible Pathways. It became the explicit intention to align the SSIP with the research based work of MTSS and PBIS that was already being implemented across the state.

To promote students' social/emotional/behavioral success, many Vermont schools are implementing PBIS, a framework for preventing and responding to problem behavior, within a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS). Vermont is now in its 10th year of implementing PBIS and in its 3rd year of implementing MTSS. The PBIS State Leadership Team supports 132 schools in the sustained implementation of PBIS while the MTSS State Leadership Team supports 109 schools across Vermont.

Vermont aims to improve the scale-up, comprehensiveness, fidelity, outcomes, and sustainability of their MTSS and PBIS schools. With improvements in each of these areas, Vermont will further align and leverage current improvement plans and initiatives to both general and special education that will impact students with Emotional Disabilities.

In order to achieve the expected outcomes of the SSIP, this team will develop a collaboration for supporting professional learning activities provided through the SPDG with particular attention to math and behavior interventions at each of the pilot schools. This will be accomplished by attending meetings, staying in communication, and collaborating with the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Management Team to reach the SSIP goals. We will need the support of the Agency School Effectiveness Coordinators (SEC) and External System Coaches at each pilot school. We will also need to determine the resources that will support individual schools as they implement their schoolwide plans to improve math outcomes for all students.

Support with data collection is another area of need for Vermont. The SSIP Leadership team and stakeholders have considered the types of data needed to demonstrate progress for students with Emotional Disturbance (ED). The team will need to develop a consistent method for capturing data that could be used across schools in order to determine the most effective and efficient instructional strategies for teachers and students. (See the steps for further alignment below.)

INFRASTRUCTURE CHANGE	RESOURCES NEEDED	EXPECTED OUTCOMES	TIMELINES	NOTES
-----------------------	------------------	-------------------	-----------	-------

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	-Attendance at meetings	-Coordinated leadership and TA across initiatives	-Happening now and will be ongoing through the duration of the
SSIP Leadership Team formation & integration with SPDG Leadership Team	-Staying in communication -Collaborating		
	-Reporting and communication from School Effectiveness Coordinators and External System Coaches at each pilot site	-Prioritized TA activities (including PD) matched to pilot site needs	SSIP
	-Evaluator	-A consistent method for capturing data that could be used across schools.	Clear, effective, efficient approach to Data collection and determination of impact:
Data Collection	-Logic Model		Year 1 - data plan design
	-MTSS External System Coaching support to design the local school data plan development and the use of the collaborative problem solving protocol	-Data analysis that is comprehensive, reflective and strategic for decision making.	Year 2-5 - data collected, reflection analysis, plan developed for strategic intervention, implementation, and progress monitoring to achieve second order systemic change.

1(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.

The Vermont SSIP Leadership Team will be the coordinating body, working with other Teams and offices, for the SEA infrastructure changes. This Leadership Team is made up of several Agency employees and an SSIP Project Manager. The team is also integrated into the SPDG Leadership Team which consists of Agency personnel, External System Coaches, and the Vermont SWIFT Coordinators. Members include:

Cindy Moran, *State Director of Special Education*, Sue Cano, *SSIP Lead/Project Coordinator*, Tracy Harris, *Coordinator of Behavioral Supports*, Tracy Watterson, *Elementary Math Consultant*, Tonya Rutkowski, *Special Education Consultant*, and Laura Baker, *Consultant for Learning Disabilities* Megan Grube, *AOE SWIFT Coordinator*, Meg Porcella, *SPDG Co-Director*. Although not members of the state leadership, the team is supported by technical assistance from Michael McSheehan, *SWIFT Vermont Liaison*, Susan Hayes, *NCSI*, and Susan Davis, *IDC*.

The SSIP Leadership team and stakeholders have considered the types of data needed to demonstrate progress for students with Emotional Disturbance (ED). We need to develop a consistent method for capturing data that could be used across schools in order to determine the most effective and efficient instructional strategies for teachers and students. Data points considered include attendance in school, office visits, time in class, teacher training specific to the Vermont Mathematics Initiative (VMI), expulsion/seclusion, time on task, functional behavior analysis (FBA) results, basic math skills proficiency, etc.

1(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the SEA, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

In order to improve the infrastructure of the agency, the SSIP will bring together many and various stakeholders within the State Education Agency (SEA) and among other state agencies.

Members within the agency will include: Mike Bailey, Special Education Data Manager, Tracy Watterson-Elementary Mathematics Assessment Coordinator, Sue Cano-VT SSIP Project Coordinator, Laura Baker, Learning Disabilities Consultant, Megan Grube, SWIFT Coordinator and School Effectiveness Coordinator, Cindy Moran, State Director of Special Education, Karin Edwards, Director of Integrated Support for Learning, Meg Porcella, SPDG Co-Coordinator, Ernie Wheeler, Special Education Monitor, Debbie Lesure, Assistant Director of Integrated Support for Learning (ISL), Tracy Harris, Coordinator for Behavioral Supports, Tonya Rutkowski, Special Education Monitor, Kate Rogers, 619 Coordinator, Deb Quackenbush, Director General Supervision & Monitoring.

Other stakeholders from outside agencies include: Jo-Anne Unruh, VT Council of Special Education Administrators, Michael McSheehan, SWIFT Center Facilitator for Vermont, Charlie Bliss-Department of Mental Health, Danielle Howes- Part C Director, Department of Children and Families, Jeff Francis, Executive Director of the Vermont Superintendents' Association, Ken Page, Executive Director of the Vermont Principals Association, Sherry Schoenberg, PBIS/BEST Coordinator, Susan Hayes, TA from NCSI, Karen Price, Director of the Vermont Family Network

The State will use several different mechanisms in order to involve these different stakeholders in the coming together to work collaboratively around the SSIP goals. These will include face to face workgroup meetings, sharing of documents in a Google Drive folder, arranging of stakeholder meetings on a regular basis, a quarterly newsletter, responding to surveys, and telecommuting via skype or gotomeeting.

Vermont held a stakeholder meeting on March 8, 2016, in order to communicate the goals of the plan and to solicit input for moving forward. We invited 39 stakeholders and had a showing of 45 people that included AOE staff who had an interest in their connection with the work. The feedback indicated: "the meeting was well organized," "facilitation of the meeting was great," "the collaborative dialogue was appreciated," "a broad representation of participants," etc. A follow-up survey provided valuable information that included responses to what will schools need from this plan, what would incentivize a school to participate in SSIP, and input to the logic model. Much of the SSIP plan is directed by their responses.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

2(a) Specify how the State will support LEAs in implementing the EBPs that will result in changes in LEA, school, and provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for children with disabilities.

MTSS/PBIS/SWIFT are frameworks that have all been implemented at some degree across the state. In choosing pilot schools for model demonstration sites, Vermont will invite those schools that meet the following criteria:

- MTSS/PBIS is being used as a framework schoolwide
- There are four (4) or more enrolled students with an emotional disturbance in the identified grade levels
- Math is a focus of their content instruction

Vermont's Phase I plan indicated that the SSIP would involve all 78 of the MTSS schools. Based on stakeholder recommendations and leadership consideration of data, those choices were reconsidered. It was decided that only four (4) schools would be chosen at this early date. These will be the SSIP implementation pilot schools. Other schools will be added incrementally over time with the intent of scaling up to all students with ED in grades 3, 4, and 5. This narrowing of school choice will provide the SSIP leadership team the opportunity to examine the research based practices currently being used in each of the pilot schools and further determine the reason for their success. Based on data and what is learned from these schools already working on their system of support, the SSIP leadership team will then develop a plan for scale up across the state.

It is the expressed intent of the SSIP, that by working with a narrower group of pilot schools that have already begun the process of building systems of support with fidelity, the knowledge gained can be scaled up to other schools that are prepared and willing to improve learning outcomes for all students.

These pilot schools will be required to submit an application that indicates their readiness and "buy in" for the work. Upon acceptance, the schools will be further supported with a menu of options to include (but not limited to):

High Quality Academic Instruction

Math curriculum and instructional strategies

Strategies for students with ED

UDL

Data Literacy

High Expectations and Growth Mindset in Math

High Quality Behavioral Support

Tiered instructional and behavioral support approaches

Trauma and its effect on learning

Data literacy

Service Delivery Models and Staffing Patterns

Parent Engagement

High Expectations and Growth Mindset

Data-Based Decision Making

PBIS

MTSS

Academic Assessment

Use of fidelity and outcome measures

Data Literacy

Capacity Building

Coaching systems

High Expectations and Growth Mindset

Participation as a pilot school will include a plan for reviewing their MTSS Implementation data, PBIS implementation data, local/state assessment system data, and determining what supports and enhancements the school will need to make to improve outcomes for students. Each school will be involved in a visioning process to determine how they will meet their individual goals for student progress. The data collection process will be designed to align with the school's desired outcome. This system evaluation done at the beginning of the project will then be used as a tool to evaluate implementation progress and effectiveness along the way.

In order to effect this change at the LEA, school and classroom level, Vermont will support the competency of highly qualified special and general teachers of math by providing training and resources at the SEA level and individualized content and systems coaching at the school/Supervisory Union level. Schools will need to organize and plan for daily scheduled time for interventions and time for coaches to plan with the general education math and special education teachers. The leadership at each school will need to recognize the priority of time for teachers to participate in the necessary professional training networks and collaborations. There will need to be clearly defined expectations for teachers to collect, reflect upon, and use a variety of data types and sources to guide instructional decision making.

A collaboration with parents and community members to support students will be expected. Effective communication strategies must be developed to ensure a coherent understanding of the SSIP practices and a belief that these practices are necessary for academic success for all students.

The technical assistance and professional development for adoption, implementation, and sustainability of the selected coherent improvement strategies and evidence based practices will include coaching support from the MTSS external systems coaches, coaching support from content specialists, and professional development opportunities for school staff and parents, specific to behavior and the content area of math. (See Menu for professional learning, above). Coaching forums for school based coaches to guide the professional learning and implementation practices will assist them in learning how to effectively coach adults within the school setting. Additionally, tools from the SWIFT Center to assist with stage-based implementation planning will be available. (MTSS coaches are currently being trained on the use of the SWIFT Center's technical assistance practices. Training and coaching to the MTSS Systems coaches from the SWIFT Center is scheduled through October, 2017.)

2(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies. Include communication strategies, stakeholder involvement, how identified barriers will be addressed; and who will implement activities and strategies; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

We expect that it will take time for teachers to learn how to engage and include students with ED in their general education classrooms. We also expect that students with ED will need time to learn effective strategies for engaging in math instruction. When students have access to and are engaged in good first instruction, their learning potential increases. Our goal is to train and support teachers as they learn to teach these students within the general education curriculum. By implementing behavioral and content specific tiers of support, we expect that student academic progress will increase. However, we know that students must have access to this instruction for it to make a difference in learning outcomes. Students with ED, in particular, often have limited access to first good instruction due to their lack of appropriate behavioral skills and frustrations with deficits in basic math skills that cause them to act out or escalate within the classroom. We want to be able to demonstrate that while academic progress might be slow, these students are making progress in maintaining appropriate behavior within the classroom. Indicators such as time in class, reduction in office referrals and suspensions, attendance, and other behavioral data will be collected to indicate progress in this area. Given time, access to first good instruction, and academic supports within the classroom, improvement of math knowledge and skills is expected to increase.

In order to effectively implement the coherent improvement strategies for the Vermont SSIP, the leadership team will need to consider the following:

1.Communication strategies:

Vermont plans to hold face-to-face meetings with its stakeholders at least every 6 months. Other communication will occur over webinars, through newsletters, and surveys will be sent out when specific feedback is needed on a particular issue. Other statewide communication will be delivered via the state's Weekly Field Memo that reaches all audiences including superintendents, principals, curriculum coordinators, special education administrators, and teachers. A listserv to specific groups of teachers can also be accessed at any time. Consideration of a google drive for documents has been discussed.

2.Stakeholder involvement:

The Vermont SSIP stakeholder group includes many and various personnel from around the state. The members involved are from the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Children & Families, the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators, The Vermont Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health, The Vermont Family Network, the Vermont Center on Disability and Community Inclusion, the Vermont Principals Association, the Vermont Superintendents Association, and Washington County Children, Youth, and Family Services. Other members include both general and special education teachers, special education administrators,

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

psychologists, and math content specialists. It is a dynamic group that has provided much valuable and experiential knowledge to the SSIP leadership team. Stakeholders will continue to be included in the ways mentioned above as the Vermont moves forward with the SSIP goals.

3. Barriers to implementation at the local level (from Phase I):

Each implementation team at each level of the cascading team model will utilize a Plan-Do-Study- Act (PDSA) or similar problem solving cycle for identifying short and long term barriers and engaging in barrier busting activities. Any barriers identified that are not in the immediate control of that team communication and feedback loop will be used in the cascading support model to address the barrier.

4. Who is responsible for implementation at LEA/School level:

The state will continue to work with the leadership team at each school through their MTSS external systems coach in order to provide on-going embedded professional learning in each school.

5. How the short and long term activities will be implemented with fidelity:

Vermont intends to use the Logic Model to develop a long range plan for implementation of the SSIP. It will require the use of a research based approach to systems change to achieve fidelity that includes the plan, do, study and act improvement cycle. This research based systems change methodology is currently required by schools in Vermont that are implementing SWIFT, MTSS and PBIS. The systems change science of the model has also been included in the development of the UDL professional development and follow up support for creating UDL coaches at the local school level. The Agency has not always used this approach to their work and has not yet effectively integrated the work happening in schools for these initiatives. However, the goal of SSIP will be to demonstrate the use of the model from the Agency level through the Supervisory Union down to the individual local schools and into the classroom where students receive their instruction in mathematics.

Achieving the goal above will require some joint professional development for external systems coaches and content specific coaches that will be working with the pilot schools. It will be necessary for all support coaches to model the use of the practice and guide pilot schools with the implementation of the philosophy so that the school culture functions in this way as their common everyday practice. This will be the second order change necessary to achieve so that we can be assured academic and social/behavioral interventions are being moved to a higher level of fidelity over the course of this project.

6. Resources and timelines for completion:

Currently, Vermont has a number of highly qualified SWIFT Coaches, MTSS External Systems Coaches and PBIS Statewide experts who serve as coaches for pilot schools and/or guide the hiring of individuals to fill this role. SWIFT, MTSS and PBIS schools have specific tools to gather information on an established schedule to assess fidelity of practice and implementation impact for the work. The schedules for when schools engage in these activities will need to be decided through the pilot process. This process will determine the frequency of data collection and analysis required to adequately respond to progress monitoring which will guide the continuous improvement planning. Local assessment and other data collected will also need to be aligned with the SWIFT, MTSS and PBIS data to ensure schools are able to reflect on all the system data holistically to guide goal setting for their work. The timeline to dig into this task will be the first year of the pilot.

Based on what is learned through the short term process outlines above, we will create mid and long term implementation and impact targets for the subsequent years of the project.

2(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the SEA (and other State agencies) to support LEAs in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the EBPs once they have been implemented with fidelity.

The coming together of multiple offices and agencies both within and outside of the SEA has been most beneficial to the goals of the SSIP. Agencies that have been invited to this work include PBIS, SPDG, SWIFT, MTSS, mental health, the AOE assessment coordinator, data coordinator, representatives from the BEST Institute, Act 230, a higher education collaboration, and several math initiatives across the state. These offices make both unique and common contributions to scale up and sustain implementation of EBPs which has allowed the AOE to consider other resources and areas of support toward the goal of improving math proficiency for students with ED. Objectives and timelines for this work will be monitored through the logic model and evaluation of goals.

Evaluation

- Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

3(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP. Specify its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for children and youth with disabilities.

The Vermont AOE has contracted with an outside evaluator to assist with the evaluation of the SSIP through its many stages of development and implementation. A Request for Proposal was posted and the AOE chose the contractor that best matched the criteria of the proposal. Work with the contractor will begin April 22, 2016.

Without the direct assistance of the outside evaluator, the team has developed a draft evaluation plan. The Vermont SSIP Leadership Team will be assisted by the NCSI and IDC TA centers in conjunction with the evaluator through the refinement of the evaluation plan. Further details will be added after the evaluator begins work with the AOE. The work will be divided into three (3) tasks:

- Meetings and Reporting;
- Refinement of the Evaluation Plan;
- Data Collection, Instrumentation, and Analysis

The evaluation plan will include evaluation methods that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the SSIP goals, objectives, and SIMR. The methods will examine the effectiveness of project implementation strategies, include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the SIMR and produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. The methods will be based on the SSIP requirements, provide performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

The evaluator will meet with the VT SSIP leadership team to review the VT SSIP Theory of Action and refine a logic model and evaluation questions to guide the development of the evaluation plan. In order to enhance the plan, other AOE staff not currently on the leadership team with expertise in assessment, will be invited to participate. This will include Michael Hock, Testing Director and Glenn Bailey, Assessment Data Manager. The plan will also involve external stakeholders in the analysis of data returned by evaluation activities so that a diverse range of perspectives and viewpoints can inform the actions are taken based on that data. Stakeholders will be critical members of the state's SSIP work moving forward.

After this initial meeting, the evaluation team will incorporate the feedback from the VT SSIP leadership team and refine the plan and timelines for activity completion. This plan will be based on the SSIP Logic Model (attached) and serve as the roadmap throughout the course of the evaluation. It will be reviewed periodically and revised as needed. The resulting evaluation plan will be aligned to the VT SSIP Implementation Framework and other SSIP documents so that the evaluation is an integral part of implementing the SSIP activities.

The evaluation plan below will be refined as needed. Activities, evaluation methods, data collection, and timelines are indicated.

VT SSIP Critical Component: Competency

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Increased access to rigorous instructional practice in Mathematics and Behavior for students

with emotional disabilities in grades 3-5 in the model demonstration sites.

Activity to Meet Outcomes	Evaluation Methods/Data Collection	Timelines/Benchmarks
Recruit and train a cadre of State level MTSS Math and Behavior content experts to provide coaching and technical assistance to SU/district/school-based personnel to impact the general math achievement and proficiency for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Training survey administered to participants to assess quality, relevance and usefulness of training and knowledge gained.• Document review/progress checklist to determine whether adequate numbers of cadre members are recruited/trained.• Observation of coaching and technical assistance to assess fidelity of support to cadre across the demonstration sites.	Years 2-3 of SSIP

with emotional disabilities in grades 3-5.

VT SSIP Critical Component: Organization

With support and technical assistance from the state and local level math and behavior content experts, participating schools will select and begin implementation of the appropriate research-based math and behavioral practices that address the needs of students with emotional disabilities and provide adequate evidence that selected practices address relevant goals.

Data is used with integrity.

Consistent expectation that

data is collected, analyzed

and used to inform

instructional and behavioral

decisions at all levels,

including local mental health agencies, of the organizational

structure, SU/SD to school.

Survey/interview with demonstration site staff to address the extent to which data is being used for instructional and behavioral decision making.

• Document review/protocol applied to demonstration site team meetings and supporting documents (e.g., data reports generated).

Year 2-5 of SSIP

A majority of the proposed scope of work falls under Task 3. Each of the subcomponents is described below.

Review and develop data collection instruments: The evaluator will work in collaboration with the

VT SSIP Leadership Team to develop data collection instruments needed to document the SSIP implementation toward meeting performance measures as outlined in the evaluation plan, and the extent to which SSIP activities are implemented with fidelity. These measures will be based on the SSIP logic model. All instruments will be carefully selected to ensure they are grounded in research. The evaluator will balance the need for the data with the demands on the participant in order to keep participant burden low. Specific instruments developed may include brief, online surveys prior to (PRE) and/or immediately following (POST) training activities to address satisfaction and initial competency, observation protocols to address fidelity of coaching for math instruction at the demonstration sites, and interviews with key informants to assess the quality of professional development and coaching, as well as challenges and supports to providing effective math instruction and behavioral supports to students at the selected SSIP sites. The evaluator will work with the project staff from the VT SPDG and PBIS initiatives to align efforts and/or share data at the selected sites as appropriate.

Implement data collection: The evaluator will collect data from SSIP staff and participating demonstration sites and ensure accurate and reliable data are collected. The evaluator will review school calendars and current data collection and reporting timelines to avoid undue burden on SSIP project staff and to ensure timely collection of the data for meeting the OSEP reporting requirements.

Analyze & report the data: The evaluator will analyze the data sets that will serve as the basis for regular reports to SSIP staff and to OSEP (e.g., APR). Reports will include data summaries, trends and recommendations for changes or mid-course corrections, if warranted. The data will be displayed in ways that maximize understanding and interpretation by SSIP staff and stakeholders.

3(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

The original group of stakeholders included an array of personnel from within and outside of the agency. In the initial stages of the development of the SSIP, this group was supportive of the broader plan for improving math learning outcomes for students with ED in grades 3, 4, and 5. Over time, it was decided that a new and more robust group of stakeholders should be involved in refining the plan and aligning their work with the goals of the SSIP would help to drive the plan toward implementation in a more efficient way. This diverse group was convened in March 2016 and expressed a strong commitment and interest in the work. Because the evaluation plan will assess the progress and demonstrate the effectiveness of the coherent improvement strategies, initial evaluation results will be shared with this group. Their input will be critical to the process of strategizing with the SSIP leadership team in support of any mid-course corrections, should they be needed.

It is expected that communication between the stakeholders and the leadership team will occur in various formats to include face-to-face meetings, surveys, and distance meetings. Communication will occur at least quarterly. In the event that more information or input is needed to move to the next step of any process more often than quarterly, stakeholder input will be collected through any of the above mentioned methods within a reasonable time frame.

3(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Vermont is recognized as a SWIFT state. We currently have two (2) supervisory unions and 8 schools participating in SWIFT. Our liaison, Michael McSheehan, is part of our stakeholder group and has been instrumental in assisting us with aligning the work of MTSS with SWIFT. That work will allow the SSIP Leadership team to use many of the valid and reliable SWIFT tools for assessing progress of the SSIP work, including universal screeners and other progress monitoring tools. These will be used over the life of the SSIP as support for those schools who do not have tools or other assessment protocols in place. Our work with the evaluator will help to match our logic model with data collection at the local level. At the local level, the evaluation will include a survey to the local implementation team which will include feedback related to the technical assistance they are receiving and questions about the actual work that is happening at the school level. Data will be analyzed by the SSIP leadership team and opportunities for stakeholders will be created to include input into the analysis process.

Because students in the target group are already members of a set criteria described in Phase II Component 2.2(a) above, it is assumed that all students will be receiving similar instruction in content as well as behavioral supports through the existing MTSS/PBIS framework. When data is collected for the targeted population, it is the intention that any improved outcomes would be indicative of all students with access to good first evidence based instruction and coherent improvement strategies. SSIP will focus first on the schools that have these systems of support in place and then scale up to schools that are underperforming in the area of math for students with ED in grades 3, 4, and 5. The SEA will be analyzing the change in student results over time (interim and summative state assessments) and how those results change from year to year.

3(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation, assess the progress toward achieving intended improvements, and make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Data will be reviewed a minimum of 2x per year by the SSIP evaluator in conjunction with the SSIP leadership team. The team will review and adjust implementation and improvement strategies as needed based upon annual data reviews.

Because the SEA is using a menu of options for TA and PD, effectiveness will be measured on a school by school basis. If the TA and/or PD chosen by that school proves to be ineffective, the SEA will suggest other activities from the menu of options based upon measured success in other participating schools.

The state will use the data review, reports from participating schools, stakeholder input and support from Susan Hayes, NCSI, and Susan Davis, IDC, to make modifications as necessary. OSEP will be kept apprised throughout the process for all modifications deemed necessary and appropriate.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include:

Infrastructure development; support for LEA implementation of EBPs; evaluation; and stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Vermont is part of the Math Learning Collaborative. The membership in this group will benefit the Agency in its ability to access the many resources and personnel that will help guide Vermont in its goal to improve math outcomes for students with emotional disabilities. The first gathering of the Collaborative was very informative and helped the Vermont SSIP leadership team make connections with other states who are also focused on improving math outcomes for students with disabilities. Vermont will benefit from more research focused on math teaching strategies that work with elementary age students with ED within an MTSS framework.

Vermont has also had the opportunity to be assisted by Susan Hayes from NCSI and Susan Davis from IDC. These two resources have been most supportive of Vermont's SSIP in providing documents, templates, facilitation of meetings, participating as thought partners, and assisting in moving forward in the development of our Phase II of the SSIP.

Vermont will continue to need this support as implementation of SSIP begins. Data collection will be a major focus and any assistance in that area will be invaluable.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Data and Overview

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

See Attached Documents

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See Attached Documents

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

See Attached Documents

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

See Attached Documents

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

See Attached Documents

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

See Attached Documents

OSEP Response

--

**FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Tonya K. Rutkowski

Title: SSIP/Monitoring Team Coordinator

Email: tonya.rutkowski@vermont.gov

Phone: 802-479-1245